DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 978 EA 007 720

TITLE School Food Program Needs--1975. State School Food Service Director's Response. A Working Paper.
INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D. C. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 214p.; 94th Congress, 1st Session, Committee Print
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($2.10)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$10.78 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Breakfast Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Lunch Programs; Nutrition; Nutrition Instruction; Program Costs; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS *National School Lunch Act

ABSTRACT

State School Food Service Directors were sent telegram questionnaires on January 23, 1975, by the above Senate committee. The purpose of the questionnaire was (1) to determine the most pressing problems facing those who have responsibility for administering the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs; and (2) to gather recommendations for strengthening the legislation, with the goal of feeding as many children as possible in an economical way. This working paper contains the individual responses by the state directors; a summary of some of the more important answers received; an analysis of the potential effect on child nutrition programs, if the administration's bloc grant proposal goes into effect; some citizen responses to the administration's proposal; and a copy of this year's legislative package for child nutrition, S. 850, with a section-by-section analysis. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

94th Congress
1st Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM NEEDS—1975

STATE SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE

A WORKING PAPER

PREPARED BY THE STAFF OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION
AND HUMAN NEEDS
UNITED STATES SENATE

(75/P4)

APRIL 1975

2

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
80-218 O WASHINGTON : 1975

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price ($2.10)

ED114978
EA 007 720

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota, *Chairman*

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia	CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan	ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota	HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin	ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
ALAN CRANSTON, California	MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota	

KENNETH SCHLOSSBERG, *Staff Director*
GERALD S. J. CASSIDY, *General Counsel*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Responses from State School Food Service Directors:	
Alabama	5
Alaska	11
Arizona	13
Arkansas	16
California	20
Connecticut	24
Delaware	27
District of Columbia	36
Florida	40
Idaho	44
Illinois	47
Iowa	52
Georgia	55
Hawaii	59
Kansas	62
Louisiana	66
Maryland	71
Minnesota	76
Mississippi	80
Missouri	83
Montana	88
New Hampshire	91
New Jersey	97
New Mexico	101
New York	104
Ohio	112
Oklahoma	116
Rhode Island	119
South Carolina	122
South Dakota	124
Utah	129
Vermont	135
Virginia	138
Washington	143
West Virginia	146
Wisconsin	148
Wyoming	152
Government of American Samoa	158
Summary of answers to survey:	
Increase in price of meals to students, 1973–74 to 1974–75	159
Average cost of producing meals, increase 1973–74 to 1974–75	159
State support per meal above required matching	160
Equipment needs	160
Number of lunches served per day	160
Number of breakfasts served per day	161
Increase in participation in reduced-price meals from school year 1973–74 to school year 1974–75	161
Effect of administration's bloc grant on child nutrition programs:	
Budget message proposes ending child nutrition programs	163

Documents and letters from concerned groups and citizens: Page
Coffee County (Douglas, Georgia) Schools ... 167
Carver Day Care Center, Schenectady, N Y ... 168
The Salvation Army Child Development Day Care Center, Albany, N.Y ... 169
City of West Haven, Conn ... 170
Office of the Governor Education & Training, Jackson, Miss ... 172
City of Hartford, Conn.: Resolution on School Breakfast Program ... 173
City of Hartford, Conn.: Resolution on Special Food Services Program for Children ... 174
Cedarburg (Wisconsin) Public Schools ... 175
Yuma, Arizona ... 176
Yakima, Washington ... 176
Pasadena, California ... 177
Milwaukee, Wisconsin ... 177
Mentor (Ohio) Public Schools ... 178
State of South Dakota, House Concurrent Resolution No. 513 ... 179
S. 850, Feb. 26, 1975 (legislative day, Feb. 21):
A bill to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts in order to extend and revise the special food service program for children, the special supplemental food program, and the school breakfast program, and for other purposes related to strengthening the school lunch and child nutrition program ... 181
Section-by-section analysis of S. 850 ... 209

INTRODUCTION

The School Lunch and Breakfast Programs continue as the foundation, the building blocks, upon which our effective and growing federally funded child nutrition programs rest.

Last year, as part of the oversight function of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I asked the committee staff to question, by telegram, all the State School Food Service Directors. The purpose of this questionnaire was twofold:

1. To determine the most pressing problems facing those who have responsibility for administering the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs; and,

2. To gather recommendations for strengthening the legislation, with the goal of feeding as many children as possible, in an economical way.

The results of the first telegram survey were very gratifying. Many of the recommendations received were later made part of legislation.

The previous response of Congress to this timely information, and the subsequent constructive use to which the data was put, have encouraged me to repeat this telegram survey to the State School Food Service Directors.

This year's (1975) questionnaire is especially interesting because, concurrently, the administration offered its own plan to reshape the child nutrition programs as we traditionally know them.

This working paper contains the individual responses by the State directors; a summary of some of the more important answers received; an analysis of the potential effect on child nutrition programs, if the administration's bloc grant proposal goes into effect; some citizen responses to the administration's proposal; and, a copy of this year's legislative package for child nutrition, S. 850, with a section-by-section analysis.

The text of the questionnaire is as follows:

WESTERN UNION NIGHT LETTER

January 23, 1975.

Dear State School Food Service Director:

As you know, Congress again is considering legislation vital to the School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Food Services, and Commodity programs.

Our committee needs information about your ability to run the programs while fighting increased food and labor costs.

Last year, your response to our telegram led to legislation which mandated increased reimbursement rates, increased and improved commodity levels, increased milk money, and escalator clauses to insure automatic adjustment.

Again, your response to the following questions will be greatly appreciated. I realize in some cases only an educated estimate can be provided. Please provide data for both public and private schools.

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your State each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month.)

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your State of producing a lunch this year? A breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

3. Has the students' price increased per lunch over last year? Per breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so, what is it?

4. How many reduced-price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced-price program on participation in your State? How many school districts have initiated the reduced-price lunches this year?

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

7. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program. Why has program participation lagged? Funding? Administrative problems? Lack of public information? School food personnel overloaded? The "this is the family job" attitude?

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program?

9. What, if any, modifications in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? the breakfast program?

10. (A.) If the commodity program were to end, how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? Do you want the commodity program to continue? If so, how would you improve it or change it?

(B.) In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? For existing programs? How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your State if the School Lunch Program were to be made universal, at 10 cents per lunch for all students? Under such a

program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional moneys needed to have such a program in your State?

13. How much time and money would your State save if a universal program replaced the current program; and the current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly?

14. What percent of the school districts in your State charge the lunch program for the cost of: (A) Utilities? (B) Transportation of USDA foods? (C) School administrative overhead? (D) Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period?

15. What, if any, are the current levels of State reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three (3) years? What is the total amount of State money you currently receive?

Thank you very much for your continued assistance and input.

GEORGE MCGOVERN, *Chairman*
U.S. SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

RESPONSES FROM STATE SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE DIRECTORS

State of Alabama
Department of Education
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama

LeRoy Brown
State Superintendent of Education

January 30, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Select Committee on Nutrition and
Human Needs
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. McGovern:

The following information is being submitted in accordance with your Telefax request of January 23, 1975.

The Alabama State Department of Education does not administer Child Nutrition Programs in private and parochial schools. These programs are administered through the U.S.D.A. Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia.

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your state each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month).

Lunches: Paid 276,728 per day
Free 289,498 per day

Breakfast: Paid 4,988 per day
Free 36,364 per day

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your state of producing a lunch this year? A breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

The average cost of producing a lunch in Alabama for the period ending December 31, 1974 was 82c. Effective January 1, 1975, the price of milk in Alabama was increased by 20 to 32%, the labor cost was increased by 5.3%, and the cost of other food and non-food items continued to increase at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 13.4%.

The average cost of producing a breakfast in Alabama for the period ending December 31, 1974 was 43.8c.

The average cost of producing meals in Alabama has increased by 9.3% for the period ending December 31, 1974 as compared to the previous school year.

The following is an estimated cost per meal for the 1974-75 school year as compared to the actual cost for the 1973-74 school year.

Lunch	1973-74	1974-75	Increase	% Increase
Food	37.0¢	42.1¢	5.1¢	13.7%
Labor	19.3¢	22.2¢	2.9¢	15%
Equipment	1.6¢	1.6¢	0	0
Other	4.3¢	5.2¢	.9¢	20.9%
Subtotal	62.2¢	71.1¢	8.9¢	14.3%
Indirect Cost	2.8¢	3.0¢	.2¢	7.1%
Subtotal	65.0¢	74.1¢	9.1¢	14%
Value of Commodities	10.0¢	10.0¢	0	
Grand Total	75.0¢	84.1¢	9.1¢	14%
Breakfast	32.3¢	36.7¢	4.4¢	13.6%
Value of Commodities	10.0¢	10.0¢		
	42.3¢	46.7¢	4.4¢	13.6%

3. Has the students' price increased per lunch over last year? Per breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so what is it?

Yes, the charge to the paying child continues to increase at approximately 7% each six (6) months. A high percent of the school systems in Alabama charge the paying child essentially the same amount they receive in U.S.D.A. reimbursement for free meals (i.e.) Lunch 49.5 cents, they charged the paying child 50 cents. 52.5 cents they charged the paying child 55 cents. Breakfast 22 cents they charged the paying child 20 cents. 23.25 cents, they charged the paying child 25 cents.

There has been no significant loss of participation when the meal price is increased. This is primarily because the increases are minimal.

Each year there is a decrease in the number of paid meals and an increase in the number of free and reduced price meals. This is brought about by more families being made eligible for free and reduced price meals when the Secretary's Income Poverty Guidelines are increased at a faster rate than the per capita income of a state.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

An average of 14,623 reduced price lunches are being served each day this year as compared with 1,043 each day last year.

An average of 617 reduced price breakfasts are being served each day this year as compared with 151 each day last year.

During the 1973-74 school year, only five (5) school systems in Alabama offered reduced price meals. This year each school system in Alabama is required to offer paid, reduced price, and free meals.

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation in your state? How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunches this year?

There has been no significant increase in the number of meals served as a result of the mandated requirement for all school systems to offer reduced price meals.

During the 1973-74 school year, 50.4% of the lunches were paid, .02% were reduced and 49.4% were free. This school year - July through December - 48.6% of the lunches were paid, 2.3% were reduced, and 49.1% were free.

During the 1973-74 school year, 10.2% of the breakfasts were paid, .05% were reduced, and 89.3% were free. This school year - July through December - 12.0% of the breakfasts were paid, 1.4% were reduced, and 86.6% were free.

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

The greatest need, legislative or otherwise, is to assist local school systems acquire capable, competent supervisory personnel. School systems with adequate, competent supervisory personnel have Child Nutrition Programs that meet the needs of the child.

We would suggest that this be a shared, coordinated effort at the federal, state, and local level.

7. The school breakfast program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program. Why has program participation lagged - funding? Administrative problems? Lack of public information? School food personnel overloaded? The "This is the family job" attitude?

Prior to the 1974-75 school year funding has not been adequate. Lack of school food service supervisors at the system level to promote and coordinate the school breakfast program. Some administrators still feel that "This is the family job."

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program?

Legislation seems to be adequate.

9. What, if any, modifications in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? The breakfast Program?

It is recommended that school feeding programs be evaluated in terms of the latest Recommended Daily Dietary Allowance by the Food and Nutrition Board, National Academy of Science, National Research Council, rather than by specific food requirements as stated in the Type A Pattern and the School Breakfast Pattern.

Serious consideration should be given to re-structuring the meal pattern requirements to permit children to receive the basic nutrients without having a specified component, such as milk, as a daily requirement. It is possible for a single component to become prohibitive because of price. For instance, milk in Alabama was increased from 20¢ to 22¢ as of January 1, 1975. I am opposed to being locked in with a single meal component over which I have no control.

10A. If the commodity program were to end how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? Do you want the commodity program to continue? If so, how would you improve it or change it?

If the commodity program were to end, Alabama would need a minimum of 13¢ per meal to be able to purchase foods of equal quality. People in all levels of school food service in Alabama very definitely want the commodity program to continue. Two things that would help improve the commodity program in this state would be to reinstate the Section 416 items and to provide funds for a warehouse system.

10B. In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

It is not possible for schools to buy meats, fruits, and vegetables from local wholesalers as cheaply as USDA is able to buy them. An example of this price differential is shown by USDA providing canned green beans at a cost of 19¢ per pound as compared to a comparable quality purchased from a local wholesaler at 34¢ per pound.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? For existing programs? How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

a. None for new programs.

b. For existing programs, $2,036,400. This figure is based on an equipment survey of equipment needs in the State of Alabama.

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your state if the school lunch program were to be made universal, at 10 cents per lunch for all students? Under such a program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your state?

Approximately 77% of the students who are in average daily attendance in public schools participate in the 1,328 National School Lunch Programs in Alabama. Only one (1) public school in Alabama does not have a food service program.

It is conceivable that 90-94% of the students would participate if the school lunch program were to be made universal.

I would favor a Child Nutrition Program that would permit each child to make a contribution to the program.

It would require a total expenditure of 80.8 million dollars to initiate a 10 cent per lunch universal program for all students. This is based on the present cost of production of lunches and an increase of 17% in the number of lunches served.

13. How much time and money would your state save if a universal program replaced the current program, and the current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly?

There would be a considerable savings of both time and money should such a program be implemented. It is estimated that 113,000 teacher days are spent in Alabama each year selling lunch tickets and taking up lunch money. This is equivalent to 4 million dollars of teaching time being spent selling tickets and taking up lunch money.

School administrators in Alabama spend an estimated 300 days each year administering free and reduced price meal policies.

14. What percent of the school districts in your state charge the lunch program for the cost of:
(A) Utilities?
(B) Transportation of USDA foods?
(C) School administrative overhead?
(D) Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period?

It is estimated that school districts pay the following percentages for the items listed from lunch program funds:

A. Utilities----------55%
B. Transportation of USDA foods----------65%
C. School administrative overhead----------15%
D. Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period---------- 5%

15. What, if any, are the current levels of state reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three (3) years? What is the total amount of state money you currently receive?

The State of Alabama does not specifically reimburse Child Nutrition Programs on a per meal basis. The state spent an average of .08 cents per meal during the 1973-74 school year for teacher retirement and social security benefits for school lunch managers and assistant managers. School systems spend legislatively appropriated funds for the operation and maintenance of Child Nutrition Programs. During the 1973-74 school year, for instance, school systems in Alabama spent an average of 2.8 cents per meal for Child Nutrition Programs.

There has been a gradual increase in the amount of state money spent for Child Nutrition Programs during the past three (3) years. The total amount of state money spent for Child Nutrition Programs during FY 74 was $3,256,657, an increase of $824,541 over the previous year.

We appreciate your efforts and support of Child Nutrition Programs. It is gratifying to know that we have friends like you in Congress who realize the importance of good nutrition.

Sincerely yours,

T. G. Smith, Jr.

T. G. Smith, Jr., Coordinator
Food Service and Local Accounting

TGS/bd

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

POUCH F – ALASKA OFFICE BUILDING
JUNEAU 99801

March 10, 1975

Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Select Committee on Nutrition
& Human Needs
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This will acknowledge and reply to your telegram of January 23 in which you requested detailed information concerning our child nutrition programs.

The answers are given in the same order as the questions were asked. They are:

1. Average number of paid lunches served per day in state 24,000
   Average free lunches served per day in state 7,300
   Average paid breakfasts served per day in state 360
   Average free breakfasts served per day in state 970

2. Average cost per lunch for FY-75 $1.13 FY-74 93¢
   Average cost per breakfast for FY-75 72¢ FY-74 78¢

3. Prices charged for lunches and breakfasts has increased over last year on an average of 10¢ for both lunch and breakfast. Participation is down 8% for paid lunches and 35% for paid breakfasts.

4. Reduced lunches served per day - 40 in FY-75
   Reduced lunches served per day - 31 in FY-74

   Reduced breakfasts served per day - 0 in FY-75
   Reduced breakfasts served per day - 0 in FY-74

5. There has been little change in the program since the expanded reduced price program came into being.

6. Increase reimbursement so that lunch price could be universally lowered.

7. Breakfast Program should have increased funding.

8. Increase reimbursement possibly.

9. Provide funds to be used specifically for nutrition education.

10. (a) A minimum of 20 per lunch.
    (b) The commodity Program should not change. Have the bulk of the food purchases made earlier in the school year.

11. (a) $30,000.00
    (b) $28,651.00

12. 60% increase.

13. Unable to project a realistic figure.

14. 25%

15. No state reimbursement.

If additional information is needed, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Marge Dawes

Marge Dawes
School Food Coordinator

MD:koc

CAROLYN WARNER
SUPERINTENDENT

Arizona
Department of Education
1535 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
271-4361

January 30, 1975

Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Chairman, United States Senate Select Committee
on Nutrition and Human Needs
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

In response to your telegram of January 23, the following are the answers to the questions of the telegram. We hope that these answers will be of help to you.

1. The School Lunch Program: There are 149,194 paid lunches; 76,069 free and reduced lunches. Breakfast: There are 4,313 paid breakfasts; 15,516 free and reduced breakfasts.

2. For fiscal year 1974, the average cost per child is $0.6943; for fiscal year 1975, the per child cost if $0.8867. For breakfast for 1974 the cost per child is $0.2079 and for fiscal year 1975 the cost per child is $0.5075.

3. The per student price has increased an average of $0.107 for lunch and has remained the same for breakfast. There was no loss of participation with lunch and increase of participation with breakfast. Perhaps the average increase in the price of lunch kept participation from increasing.

4. Reduced price lunches per day for fiscal year '74, 243; for fiscal year '75, 1,522. Reduced price breakfasts per day for fiscal year '74, 29; for fiscal year '75, 138. Free lunches per day, 63,835 for fiscal year '74; 74,547 for fiscal year '75. Free breakfasts per day for fiscal year '74, 13,176; for fiscal year '75, 15,378.

5. The effect of the expanded reduced price program increased participation. There have been 26 school districts and 186 schools which have initiated the reduced price lunches this year.

6. In order to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program, we feel that reducing the number of components of the Type A lunch or going to the Nutrient Standard Approach as suggested by the USDA as long as the child receives one-third USRDA for lunch.

50-215 O - 75 -- 2

Greater variety would improve sales. This is especially true with the new engineered foods which are vitamin and protein enriched, thereby eliminating the necessity for the three-fourth cup vegetable requirement and the two ounces from protein. One very effective method for increasing the number of paying students would be to increase the amount of Section 4 funds available and increase reimbursements.

7. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program for several reasons. First, administrators hesitate to add new scheduling and budgeting problems to their already busy schedules. Second, food service directors hesitate to run the risk of losing money on the breakfast program. In many schools breakfast costs are $.30 to $.40 and the complaints of these school food service directors are heard by other school administrators trying to decide whether to join the program. There is also a problem with the distribution of tickets in some districts. Children arrive in the morning and are served breakfast immediately.

8. The greatest change in legislation that could improve the breakfast program would be to make the program free to every child. This would eliminate the stigma attached to the difference in price; it would increase participation. Also, a regulation specifying the quality of cereal products stating a minimum percentage of protein in the cereal offered would help meet the RDA, especially in families where protein is a problem.

9. Reducing the amount of milk necessary to meet the Type A lunch from one-half pint to one-third pint for children kindergarten through third grade would reduce the milk and food waste and reduce costs. One-half pint is too large a volume for small children, and if a child is full he won't eat the other components of the lunch.

10. A: About $.15 per meal would be needed if the commodity program was to end. The commodity program should continue in order to help smaller school districts which don't have the purchasing power of the larger districts. Red meats need to be processed at the distributors' level rather than at the local level. A portion of the ground beef should arrive as patties.

    B: The three commodities chosen to decide the difference between the wholesale price and the price that USDA can send: chicken - commodity price, $.46, wholesale price, $.55, a difference of $.09 minus $.01 per pound for freight or a net difference of $.08 per pound for chicken; ground beef - commodity price, $.64, wholesale price, $.80, a difference of $.16 per pound and with freight of $.01 per pound, a net difference of $.15 per pound between the wholesale price and the commodity price; for canned green beans - $5.36 is the commodity price per case, the wholesale price is $10.04 per case, a difference of $4.68 per case, plus a difference of $.03 per pound, or a total net difference of $3.54 between the commodity price and the wholesale price.

11. For the coming fiscal year, we have verbal requests for both new and existing programs totaling $46,000 and written requests totaling $120,000 for existing and $125,000 for new programs. One problem that does present itself with the request to non-food assistance is a problem with the regulations. A new program school within a district is ineligible for new funds and must compete with existing programs for unreserved funds. During fiscal year '75, unreserved funds for Arizona amounted to $134,000 and requests for the same period amounted to $165,000. Requests far exceed available money, and will for at least the next five years.

12. Considering the present participation in the lunch program and assuming a 20 percent increase in participation if the school lunch program were to go over to a universal program, the revenue derived from that would be $26,529. Assuming the revenue at present, which is the present participation, times the present average charge per meal, which is $.38, and you have a present revenue of $84,008.50, this will give you a net difference between the present revenue and future revenue of $57,479.50. Subtracting the present revenue from the present cost gives you a net deficit of $112,748.25. For the future deficit, take the future participation multiplied by the present cost which will give the future cost of the meal. Subtract from that the future revenue and you come up with a figure of $209,579.10. The difference between the future deficit and the present deficit would give you a total of $96,830.85. If the school lunch program was to go over to a universal program, it would cost an additional $96,830.85 per day.

13. If the state went over to a universal school lunch program, the state division would not save much money, because the state would continue to have to have administrative reviews and would have to monitor no-program schools. However, at the local level, savings of somewhere around 20 percent of time would be taken up because there would no longer have to be the difference between the free, reduced price and paid lunches.

14. What percent of the school districts in your state charge the lunch programs for the cost of utilities? - 30 percent. Transportation of USDA foods? - 100 percent. School administrative overhead? - three percent. Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period? - 100 percent. We have no statistics for this question.

15. In Arizona, there are no levels of state reimbursement for the lunch program, the breakfast program or for any other program. The state picks up some of the administrative costs, but does not reimburse school districts. The only reimbursement comes from USDA.

We hope this information will be of help to the Committee, and we look forward to continued good relations between our Division and those interested in the school lunch program.

Sincerely yours,

Junetta Barrett

Junetta Barrett, Director
Food and Nutrition Division

State of Arkansas
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
RABIE RHODES HARRISON CHAIRMAN
JIM DUPREE WELDON VICE CHAIRMAN
T C COGBILL JR STAR CITY
DR ELLIS GARDNER RUSSELLVILLE
WAYNE HARTSFIELD SEARCY
JACK E MEADOWS CROSSETT
HARRY A HAINES BLYTHEVILLE
THE REV EMERY WASHINGTON LITTLE ROCK
MRS JAMES W CHESNUTT HOT SPRINGS
A W FORD
DIRECTOR

STATE EDUCATION BUILDING LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72201

TELEPHONE
371-1461

February 11, 1975

Senator George McGovern, Chairman
U.S. Senate Select Committee
Nutrition and Human Needs
OSOB Building Room 362
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

Reference is made to your telegram inquiry concerning statistical information as these relate to the operation of the Child Nutrition Programs in the State of Arkansas. All information is applicable only to the Public Schools since the State Department of Education is restricted to the administration of matters limited to the Public School Districts.

1. The average daily number of paid, free and reduced price lunches served for the month of October 1974 was 308,988. In addition, there were 25,893 breakfast meals served each day during the same month.

2. This year, the average cost of producing a lunch is approximately 75¢. The cost of producing the breakfast meal is from 35¢ to 40¢. These figures do not reflect the contribution made to the meal cost by USDA donated commodity foods, which will exceed 12¢ per meal, this year, due to the unusual receipts of high priced beef and poultry products. These figures represent an increase in the cost of the lunch by about 10¢ and the breakfast by about 5¢ per meal compared to last year's operation.

3. Prices to paying students have increased an average of at least 5¢ per meal for lunch and breakfast meals. This reflects situations in which many schools have increased prices by as much as 10¢ and 15¢ while some have not considered it a wise decision to raise prices for fear of losing participation. The introduction of the reduced price structure for the first time this year, has alleviated some of the need for price increases. With no more adjustments in price than have been necessary so far, there has been minimal loss in participation to this date. However, administrators are reporting severe financial stresses in their operations and relate that there seems to be no alternative to further increases in student charges. What effect this will have on participation, will only be revealed in the future.

"AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER"

4. The reduced price meal concept in this state is new and operational for the first time this year. Consequently many school administrators have not yet realized the maximum advantage to be had with this program. Only since major industries and other labor sources have terminated or disrupted employment, have schools begun to realize the need for this service. As of to-date, there are 1504 reduce price lunches and 366 reduced price breakfast meals being reported each day. There were none last year.

5. In light of information referred to in (4) above, there are a few less than 50 schools offering reduced price meals at the present time. There are quite a few others who have indicated their intentions to participate in the future.

6. There are many factors which affect the participation of paying students, especially those of secondary age level. Any legislative changes to stop the loss of paying students would necessarily have to do with regulating or controlling the price charged to the student. There may be some merit in adjusting the national average reimbursement rates to reflect an increase in Section 4 allocation with a corresponding decrease in Section 11 allocation on a per meal formula basis. With the inclusion of practical escalation provisions, this would enable schools to more or less stablize the prices charged to students.

7. The breakfast program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program for several reasons:

   a. It is relatively new. When first introduced the funding allowed was not adequate to promote the program. Restrictions imposed then were not conducive to its promotion. Some of this stigma still prevails.

   b. Administrative problems particularly in the matter of scheduling.

   c. School administrators are not as enthusiastic as with the lunch program. Too many of them still feel as if breakfast is a family responsibility.

8. Present legislation pertaining to the breakfast program seems to be adequate and practical for the promotion of a good program. Given enough time, the testimonies concerning the benefits of this program which are being used for promotional purposes, will show a marked increase in number of schools operating a breakfast program.

9. The matter of decreasing plate waste and increasing participation, will not be affected as much by modifications in the meal pattern as it will be with emphasis on the teaching of nutrition education to students. It has been demonstrated and proven in this state that the answer to most of the dietary, nutritional and poor eating habits of school children can be enhanced materially with the teaching of nutrition education to elementary pupils by elementary teachers working in close cooperation with school food service personnel and school administrators. Funding for Nutrition Education Services is greatly needed.

10. In the event the commodity program were terminated, the schools in this state would need, at a minimum, 10¢ to 12¢ additional funds per meal to offset the loss from this source. The school administrators in this state definitely want the commodity program to continue.

It is impossible for schools, especially the smaller districts, to purchase from wholesalers food items such as frozen meats, canned fruits and vegetables, as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality. A typical example is the frozen frankfurters which is placed in the school for approximately 84¢ per pound. If the same quality product could be purchased locally, it would cost the school $1.37 per pound.

11. Since 99.9% of all school children in Arkansas have access to the school lunch program, the need for equipping no program schools is insignificant. There are nonfood assistance applications on hand and being processed for approval in existing programs for a total need of approximately $250,000. This state has been allocated $182,859 for use during this current fiscal year. This is $23,278 less than was allocated last fiscal year.

12. If the school lunch program were to be made universal at 10¢ per lunch for all students, there would probably be a 15% to 20% increase in participation. I would favor such a program if it were implemented by degrees and over a long enough period to enable the schools to adjust to extra needed facilities, etc. to accommodate the increases in participation. It is very difficult to estimate the additional funds which would be needed to have such a program in this state.

13. It has been my observation and experience, that adjustments in Federal program operations do not eliminate or reduce time or money in terms of reporting and paperwork. This is not to say that there should not or could not be a reduction of at least 25% in effort and money.

14. Approximately 10% of the school districts in this state charge the lunch programs for the cost of utilities as a direct charge.

    No more than 20% of the schools charge the school lunch program for transportation of USDA foods. The State Legislature appropriated $150,000 each year to help defray the cost of transportation of USDA commodities.

    None of the schools charge school administrative overhead cost to the lunch program as a direct charge. Custodial, clerical, teacher personnel for supervision during the lunch period are typical indirect costs paid from other school operating funds and charged to the cost of producing the school meal.

15. For the current fiscal year 75, all state reimbursement funds are allocated for lunches only as there are no state funds designated for breakfast programs. The state aid for FY 75 has increased in excess of 47% over FY 74. The total amount of State funds currently received for this year is $550,000.00 plus $150,000 for delivering USDA commodities to local schools.

I trust that this information will assist you in helping to promote and maintain the much needed Child Nutrition Program, a program considered by many to be one of the most important and far reaching of all Federal programs. Information pertaining to the President's 1976 budget has come to our attention. I dare not disseminate this information to school administrators for I know that it would generate a barrage of protests.

Please be assured that all School Food Service Personnel, who are close to our Nation's children's nutritional needs and who speak not only for the parents but the children as well, do sincerely appreciate your untiring effort and energies in behalf of the young school generation of today and the days ahead.

Sincerely,

J. A. Niven, Coordinator
School Food Services

JAN:rc

Wilson Riles
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION BUILDING, 721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814
(916) 445-0850
January 28, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

The following is the data you requested concerning the School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Food Services and Commodities programs.

Response to Questions 1-5

	1974-75	1973-74
Total lunches/da (ADP)	1,304,100	1,299,559
Total breakfasts/da (ADP)	181,260	107,336
Average cost/lunch	.80	.65
Average cost/breakfast	.45	.35
Average student price/lunch	.50	.40
Average student price/breakfast	.25	.20
Number of Reduced Price lunches/da	108,640	26,550
Number of Reduced Price breakfasts/da	12,100	10,620

From this data, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The breakfast program grew 41 percent between FY 1974 and FY 1975

2. The cost of a lunch increased 23 percent while the charge to the child increased 25 percent

3. The number of reduced priced lunches per day increased over 300 percent

Approximately 75 sponsors initiated the Reduced Price Meal Policy as a result of the changes in the eligibility scale. The largest sponsor in the state, Los Angeles Unified School District, did not choose to use the Reduced Price Meal Policy because of the increase in accounting and reporting requirements. The District personnel pointed out that it would require eight different tickets; three for the lunch program, three for the breakfast program, and two for the milk program, if the District were to offer Reduced Price Meals. The District has an A.D.A. of over 600,000 students, housed in approximately 500 sites.

Question 6

The loss of the paying student in the lunch program is a result of a complex series of events. The Legislature can impact these events by increasing the reimbursement rate, increasing the amount of Non-Food Assistance, developing a better system for identifying the amount of reimbursement due a sponsor, supporting nutrition education, and integrating the child nutrition programs into the instructional program. By increasing the reimbursement the charge to the paying child may be reduced; increased Non-Food Assistance could be used to change the lunchroom environment; a better system of identification of children eligible for free, reduced priced or paid meals would reduce stigma of participating in the lunch and breakfast programs; increased nutrition education would bring the concept "You are what you eat" into focus; integration of the lunchroom into the classroom's activities would be of great significance in achieving the objective of recognizing the value of good nutrition.

Question 7

Only about one person in ten that participates in the lunch program participates in the breakfast program. However, the state experienced a 41 percent growth in this program last year. Much of this growth is due to a change in the interpretation of the breakfast regulations. The California Office of Food and Nutrition Services now approves a school as an "especially needy school" if more than 75 percent of the children participating in the breakfast program are eligible for free or reduced priced meals. There is a state regulation that requires additional protein in the meals served in this program.

Question 8

The Legislature could more clearly define its intent relative to the "Especially Needy" program. The Legislature should recognize that statewide average rates of reimbursement is difficult for the state agency to administer and unacceptable as a management tool.

Question 9

The meal pattern is nutritionally sound. A method of increasing the variety of entrees and other components needs to be developed.

Question 10

(a) In 1973-74, 245,416,276 breakfasts and lunches were served in the schools. The value of the commodities distributed to the schools for the same year was $21,184,202.66 for a fair market value of $.086 per meal.

Based upon the computations in the response to Question 8, 350,000,000 lunches multiplied by $.06 per lunch would equal $30,100,000. This would represent a loss of income to the lunch and breakfast programs for FY 1976 if the Commodity program were to be discontinued.

(b) In California, it is almost impossible to generalize about the ability of sponsors to utilize commodities as opposed to an increase in reimbursement rate. Larger districts would, generally, prefer cash. The medium to smaller districts would like commodities and cash.

Question 11

The allocation to the State of California for equipment for new programs is $2,323,521 and for existing programs is $784,987. This amount of money is to assist sponsors in serving nearly one quarter billion meals each year. In terms of need, the amount of money available for replacement and improvement is totally inadequate. The amount of money for new programs should be adequate. However, if the Office were to redirect their efforts towards the outreach program and were successful in signing agreements with one third of the 308 districts that are not currently participating in the child nutrition programs, then this amount of money would also be totally inadequate.

Question 12

The ADP for FY 1974 was 1.3 million students. Enrollments in FY 1975 and 1976 are estimated to be 4.5 million students. If a universal reduced priced lunch program were introduced, it is estimated that participation in the lunch program should grow approximately 50 percent to serve 2.0 million students or 44 percent of the population of the schools. In FY 1974 the schools served:

45%	109,138,290	Paid lunches
2%	5,349,863	Reduced Price lunches
49%	109,174,795	Free lunches
100%	223,662,859	Total lunches

Based upon this data, a projected 2.0 million students would consume 350 million lunches annually. Using the established percentages,

49%	171,000,000	Paid lunches
2%	7,000,000	Reduced Price lunches
49%	171,500,000	Free lunches
100%	350,000,000	Total lunches

The Office of Food and Nutrition Services is in favor of the universal reduced price lunch and breakfast program, however, the need for meals served without cost to the needy child will remain. From an educational standpoint, the universal breakfast program would be of greater benefit to the students. Nutrition prior to, or at the beginning of, the school day makes the student more receptive to the educational program offered in the classroom.

Based upon a cost of 80 cents per lunch, it is estimated that

350,000,000 lunches x $.80	=	$280,000,000
less 10¢ per Reduced Price and paid lunch	=	17,800,000
*less estimated reimbursement	=	$117,950,000
Estimated increase		$144,250,000

* Computed by dividing the FY 1974 Section 4 and Section 11 reimbursement by the number of meals for the year ($75,121,709 divided by 223,662,858 = 33.7 cents) and multiplying that average reimbursement per meal by the anticipated number of meals served ($.337 x 350,000,000)

Question 13

The lunch and breakfast reimbursement programs are processed by computer. The saving in auditing and accounting man hours, therefore, would be minimal. It is estimated that processing the free and reduced price meal policies takes one fourth of a man year.

Question 14

Most of the 887 districts make a charge against the lunch program for utilities. About half make a charge against the program for transportation of the U. S. Department of Agriculture Commodities and the employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period. No district makes a charge against the program for cost of the superintendent. However, more districts make a charge against the program for food service supervisory personnel and for the business office function.

Question 15

In FY 1975, the State of California will reimburse school district sponsors five cents for each lunch and breakfast. This is the first year for this program and it will result in an expenditure of approximately $12,500,000.

Thank you for your continued support of Child Nutrition Programs.

Sincerely,

John R. Weber

John R. Weber, Director
Office of Food and Nutrition Services

JRW:JEW:ss

cc: Mr. O. D. Russell

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Box 2219 — Hartford, Connecticut 06115

566 3195

February 3, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
U. S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Senator McGovern,

This is in response to your telegram of January 23, 1975.

Question No.

1. November, 1974

Lunches ADP		Breakfast ADP
Paid -	150,199	246
Free -	66,119	1,546
Reduced -	6,091	13
Total	222,409	1,805

2. Average cost of producing a meal established on a September through December, 1974 analysis:

Average cost to produced Type A Lunch - $.7285
Average cost to produced Breakfast - .26

Average cost in June for the FY74:
Type A Lunch - $.6491
Breakfast - .18

This represents a 12.2% increase in Type A lunch costs.

3. Increase in Student price - Lunch only:

There are 175 National School Lunch Contracts. Of these, 22 increased 5¢, and 10 increased 10¢.

4. Reduced Price Lunches:

May - 1974 ADP		Nov. - 1974 ADP
Paid -	154,463	150,199
Free -	59,101	66,119
* Reduced -	2,571	6,091
Total	216,135	222,409

Reduced Price Breakfast are extremely small.

5. There has been a dramatic increase in reduced lunches and 66 2/3% of the school systems enrolled in National School Lunch Programs participate in the reduced price lunch.

6. To keep the paying child, the price must be kept low. Universal reduced price lunch would probably accomplish this.

7. The Breakfast Program has lagged because of administration's attitudes, bussing schedules, and costs involved.

8. If supervision costs were included in the breakfast reimbursement, the program probably would have more appeal to administrators.

9. Modification in the meal pattern is difficult and still meets the nutritional needs of the child. Nutrition education is so badly needed, especially in relation to the fruit and vegetable components.

10. a). Approximately 10% currently received with escalation clause written in to protect for possible increase in cost of food. Would like to see the commodity program continue to allow for agricultural surplus or support programs. Grains, if added, allow for contracts for breads, pasta, etc., which are large use items.
b). Yes, it is possible for large school systems to purchase as outlined in the stated question, however, there are may be smaller school systems where it would not be possible.

11. Non-food Assistance

Program - unreserved	122,430
No Program - reserved	398,832

Since Connecticut still has 211 public schools and 322 private schools not enrolled in the program, non food assistance funds are needed.

12. Present number of lunches served daily - 222,409
Number of public school children - 640,463
Universal reduced price lunch would at minimum, double the present participation.

Cost of a Type A lunch -	$.73
Child payment	.10
Fed. reimbursement	.63 X 500,000= $315,000 daily

or $56,700,000 annually.

13. The State Office would not save as much time as would the local sponsor, especially if Free and Reduced Policies were dropped.

14. A. Very few - 1-2%
B. 100%
C. 72%
D. None - not permitted

15. State Matching Reimbursement:

	FY74	FY75
Type A lunch:	$.008	.01
Reduced:	.003 + .008	.01 + .01
Free:	.037 + .008	.0325 + .01
Breakfast:	.01	
Totals FY74-	$503,401	FY75- 650,000

I hope this information will be of help to you.

Very truly yours,

Ann R. Tolman

Ann R. Tolman, R. D., Consultant
Child Nutrition Programs

ART/ats

STATE OF DELAWARE

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

THE TOWNSEND BUILDING
DOVER, DELAWARE 19901

KENNETH C. MADDEN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

RANDALL L. BROYLES
HOWARD E. ROW
JOHN J. RYAN
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

January
31st
1975

Honorable George McGovern
Chairman, Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This is in reply to your January 23, 1975 telegram requesting information about Delaware's school food service programs, particularly in reference to increasing food and labor costs associated with the operation of these programs. Due to the number and length of the questions, I will not restate each one, but, rather will list each question number with a parenthetical reference to the general subject area for the benefit of those receiving courtesy copies of this letter.

Question 1. (Participation data)

Our FNS-10 report for December, 1974 indicates an average daily attendance of 119,007 and an average daily participation of 72,523 (61%) in the National School Lunch Program. For the same month, school breakfast program ADA was 29,070; ADP was 4,534 (16%). 51,197 paid lunches were served each day; 20,034 free lunches were served each day. Of the 4,534 total breakfasts, 3,518, or 78%, were served free; 964 per day, or 21%, were fully paid breakfasts.

Question 2. (Production costs of lunches and breakfasts)

I estimate that the average total cost of producing a Type A lunch in Delaware's schools this school year is between 78 and 80¢. Last school year's average was about 75¢. The estimated total average cost of producing a qualifying breakfast is about 35¢ this year compared to 31.2¢ last school year.

Question 3. (Meal prices in relation to participation)

Because of considerable State financial assistance to the school food service programs (covered in detail in my reply to Question 15), school lunch prices in Delaware remain relatively low. In addition, I do not believe that lunch price increases in Delaware were as frequent or as great compared to the National pattern. I am enclosing a copy of a State-wide school meal price survey done early this school year. Eleven school districts did not raise their prices; ten school districts raised the prices by generally 5¢; and, only five raised the prices by 10¢ or more. In checking the four largest school districts that reported 10¢ lunch price increases, I was unable to correlate a loss of participation. Two of the four districts reported participation about equal to last school year; the other two reported participation equal to, or even slightly larger, than last school year. This pattern does not follow the traditional observation that participation goes down as prices go up. Of course, it is possible that participation in these districts would have increased or increased at a higher rate, as the case may be, had prices remained stable. It is very likely that, after observing the cost of meals away from home at commercial establishments, the Type A lunch has become a more attractive bargain than ever before, even at higher prices, when compared to lunch prices outside the school.

Questions 4 and 5. (Reduced price meal information)

In December, 1974, 1,293 lunches and 53 breakfasts were served at a reduced price each school day. This compares to 545 lunches and 28 breakfasts in December, 1973. 19 of the 26 public school districts now have the reduced price option compared to 13 last school year. This expansion of the reduced price option has no doubt caused the over twofold increase in the number of reduced price lunches served each day. While commendable, these data are hardly encouraging since we are working from such a low base. Last school year, less than 3% of the total number of free and reduced price lunches were served at a reduced price. One of our FY 1976 State Plan goals is to have every participating school district offering the reduced price lunch option by the end of the school year. We plan to stress the permanency of the 175% income scale, the income range it covers, the assistance to the marginal or "near poor" that availability of reduced price meals offers and the ethical responsibility that a school food authority has to offer such meals in an inflationary period with all its attendant difficulties. We are also stressing the benefits to the school district that could result from higher, more predictable participation and the lower per meal cost that should result from this action.

Question 6. (Suggested legislative changes to remedy loss of paying students in the lunch program)

I believe passage into law of your Bill S3864- "National Nutrition Education Act 1974", or a similar bill represents the best long-range approach to this problem. I believe that only when our Nation's school children obtain sound, sensible, nutrition education as part of their curriculum, and when parents receive sound and sensible information about nutrition, will parents require and/or students voluntarily participate in the fully paid lunch program. Unfortunately, even if such a bill became law tomorrow, it could probably do little to change the eating habits of school children presently in the higher grades but, at least, it would be a step in the right direction in stimulating a future awareness among our Nation's schoolchildren of the benefits of good nutrition. Meanwhile, we can only encourage schools to use existing tools as imaginatively as possible to make the child nutrition programs more attractive to paying students. (More on this in response to Question 9.)

Questions 7 and 8. (School breakfast program - problems and suggested remedies)

I believe that, to varying degrees, all the suggested problems listed in your question play a part in the rather disappointing progress made by the School Breakfast Program. To us, however, administrative problems and attitudes and rescheduling of school food service personnel are the most important problems. In Delaware, as in many states, it is necessary to prove the need for this program on other bases than mere economic need alone. Thus, we make every effort to point out the dietary deficiencies and poor eating habits regarding breakfasts of large segments of the public which transcend both cultural and economic considerations. Most school authorities are reticent about starting a new program which requires adjustment of classroom, bus, and cafeteria personnel schedules for a program with an apparently small base. In many cases, it is only when school officials are convinced of the wide-spread need for the breakfast program based on nutritional need of the majority of students that they become sufficiently interested in implementing a program.

As to Question 8, I can think of no substantial legislative changes needed to improve the School Breakfast Program. I believe it is more a matter of making parents and children alike aware of the nutritional importance of a balanced breakfast every day. To help achieve this objective and to further the goal of increased breakfast program participation, it occurs to me that, perhaps, we could make better use of the link between school food service and the schools' health and hygiene component.

50-218 O - 75 -- 3

Perhaps, it would enhance the program's stature and importance, for example, if the school breakfasts were "prescribed" by medical authorities similar to what is done in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children ("WIC"). It might be possible, for example, for a physician, while giving a child a physical examination prior to entering school, to recommend (or "prescribe") that, in order to enhance the nutritional well-being of the subject that he be entitled (and encouraged) to participate in the School Breakfast Program on a "prescription" basis. Also, the school nurses might be involved on the same basis, particularly, to note changes in body weight, height, general physical well-being, etc. Such a program would not only utilize the mutual capacities of both groups but, more importantly, would stress to all the importance of the school breakfast program as a valuable adjunct to good health.

Question 9. (Suggested modifications in meal patterns)

I am convinced that there is little, if any, relationship between the lunch and breakfast meal pattern and the problems of participation and plate waste. I believe there is sufficient flexibility within both these meal patterns to attract children to the programs and have them consume what is served provided that: (a) there are a reasonable number of choices within each food group, and (b) the school makes a reasonable attempt to have the menus reflect food items preferred by its students. Almost every single food item that can be purchased at the increasingly popular commercial fast-food franchises can be adapted to the Type A lunch program. Hamburgers, hotdogs, pizzas, fried chicken, Mexican food, etc., can all, with a little supplementation, be the core of the Type A lunch. Thus, if schools will use the flexibility contained in these meal patterns to adapt to student preferences, there should be no problem. However, the only way to make certain that schools are reflecting student preferences is to involve the students in such activities as food preference surveys, youth advisory committees, menu planning functions, etc., to the maximum extent feasible in each school.

Since milk is the only inflexible item in both patterns, some thought might be given to alternative beverage items. But, since milk is such a well-balanced food in itself, such approval of alternative beverages should be considered only after establishing that the present milk requirement definitely contributes to problems of participation and plate waste.

Question 10. (Commodity distribution program)

I have already sent you a copy of my January 28, 1975 letter to Senator Biden in response to his inquiry about State-wide preferences regarding cash vs. commodities. Briefly, 21 of the 24 respondents (public school districts) favored continuation

of some form of the commodity distribution program. Since it is the individual school districts who are most affected by the existence or non-existence of the commodity program, their concensus is much more valuable than my individual views. While our commodity survey did not specifically address itself to desired cash levels needed to supplant commodities, my impression is that most school districts could resign themselves to the present 10¢ per meal and the escalator provisions set forth in P.L. 93-326 if necessary.

As to Part B of your question, the State Distributing Agency made a study for a six month period during FY 1974 for the purpose of estimating the difference between the cost to the Federal Government for commodities distributed during that period and the local purchase price for the same type of foods. The study indicated a net savings of nearly $200,000 for the period which, in turn, reflected a savings of about 22% under commercial prices for the same foods. These data tend to support the position that individual school districts, purchasing locally in relatively small amounts, are not able to buy the variety and quantity of foods for the same amount of money. I believe this type of State-wide information is of more value than giving an example of the cost differential for one food item as your telegram suggests. Even in a state as small as Delaware, there are wide variations in wholesale prices depending upon such factors as proximity to a metropolitan area, the size of the school district, the location of the school district in relation to main transportation routes, etc. This differential is most dramatically demonstrated in the purchasing power, for example, of a suburban school district of 15 to 20 thousand students vs. a rural school district with a thousand students or, evenmore, a child care center of 20 or 30 children in which much of the food might be purchased from a retail food store.

Question 11. (Equipment needs)

In the FY 1974 equipment survey mandated by P.L. 92-433, we reported a State-wide need for about $88,000 for equipment. Our FY 1974 Unreserved ("U") equipment allocation of about $35,000 took care of about $50,000 of that stated need. However, I would estimate, that as some schools get older, and as equipment prices rise, we could still use about $50,000 for maintenance and expansion of existing food service programs and about $15,000 in Reserved ("R") for the initiation of lunch and/or breakfast programs in "no program" schools. Thus, our FY 1975 Unreserved equipment allocation of $43,337 would probably be sufficient for our equipment needs for existing programs.

Since all public schools in Delaware participate in the lunch and/or breakfast programs, the "R" equipment funds can, in effect, be used only in the nonprofit private schools without food service facilities and not participating in the Child Nutrition Programs. Although we have been in contact from time to time with the private school sector, they have shown little interest in establishing Child Nutrition Programs in the thirty-seven private schools reported without a food service. As a result, we returned over $32,000 in "R" equipment funds last fiscal year because of the lack of interested eligible recipients. As a result, our "R" equipment apportionment this year was reduced to $22,885; we may be unable to utilize even that reduced sum if the same lack of interest prevails. At least, in Delaware, it would be helpful if we had some flexibility in the administration of these two separate funds. Certainly, every effort should be made to encourage no-program, no-facility schools to avail themselves of Nonfood Assistance Program funds. However, it appears to me, that late in the fiscal year and with complete documentation (including waiver by these schools) that the funds will not be used, some legislative provision might be made to allow the "R" funds to be used within the State to further maintain and expand existing programs in both public and private schools.

Question 12. (Universal reduced price lunch program)

This is the question where one gets into "educated estimates". First, I estimate that about 90% of the average daily attendance, or about 108,000 school children would participate in this type of program each school day. This represents about a 35% increase in present average daily participation. Secondly, I am using a per lunch cost of 80¢ from which I have subtracted 20¢ in State and local inputs and the 10¢ children's payment. This leaves a remainder of 50¢ that would have to be absorbed by Federal reimbursement payments (55¢, if the local contribution were factored out). Depending upon whether a 50 or 55¢ rate were applied, I would estimate a cost of between $9.7 and $10.7 million per year. At an average of $10.2 million, this program would cost about $6.6 million more than the present program which I project at $3.6 million for FY 1975.

Philosophically, I favor such a program. I believe that some form of payment by every child, if possible, enhances their feeling of self-respect as well as contributes to the esteem for the lunch in that even a token payment for the meal helps impress upon the child that the meal is valuable. My reservations about the success of such a program would be, that since the vast majority of children, both here and nationwide, presently participating in the free and reduced price lunch aspects of the program, are receiving the meals totally free, there could be stubborn opposition to such a program, particularly by the parents of the over 8.5 million children

nationwide presently receiving totally free lunches. Of course, you are much better qualified than I to assess the American character: I just don't believe that one can realistically expect that the parents of that many children would be willing to pay even 10¢ for something that they heretofore received free for their children. Even though the reduced price was minimal, I am sure the point would be made that poor people were now forced to pay the same for their children's lunch as rich people. An alternative to your proposal might be a program in which present eligibility standards for free lunches would be maintained with all other children eligible for a 10¢ universal reduced price lunch.

Question 13. (Administrative savings resulting from a universal program)

It is difficult to estimate the administrative cost of the certification and recordkeeping requirements of the present free and reduced price lunch program. Depending upon the method applied, I estimate a range of cost between $125,000 and $780,000 with perhaps a figure of $650,000 being fairly accurate. The latter figure was a simple multiplication of the total number of lunches to be served during the school year times 5¢. This method is based on the premise that one could justify a per lunch cost on all lunches served since there is a program cost of determining non-eligibility for free and reduced price lunches as well as eligibility, there is a cost to the total program for fully paid tokens, tickets, charge slips, etc., and that there is a bookkeeping cost applicable to all categories of lunches since factoring out free and reduced price lunches for reimbursement requires that paid lunches also be factored out for separate reimbursement.

Question 14. (Allocation of indirect program costs)

The per lunch and breakfast cost reported in reply to Question 2 all included the type of indirect costs listed in your telegram. However, only about two school districts are using the Full Cost concept or Cost Based accounting recommended by USDA in their financial management handbooks in which direct and indirect costs are charged to the program according to a formal cost allocation plan. The Statewide estimates of meal costs given in reply to Question 2 were generally derived by applying a standard indirect rate of 10%, as suggested by Federal Management Circular 74-4, and documented as more or less in those school systems with the capacity to report these costs by a formal cost allocation plan.

Question 15. (Levels of State support for the Child Nutrition Programs)

Direct State expenditures for the school lunch and breakfast programs in FY 1973 were $1,413,888; for FY 1974 expenditures were $1,585,769; for FY 1975, $1,617,706 has been budgeted. These funds are disbursed to the local school districts to pay the salaries of school food service managers and supervisors who are

on a State salary scale. Since the State also pays the "Other Employment Costs" (fringe benefits) of these employees, these figures include the additional 20% cost of providing these benefits.

On July 19, 1974, Governor Tribbitt signed into law SB 582 which provides that, based on a formula of 7 hours of labor per 100 meals, a minimum of 25% of school food service cooks'/bakers' and general workers' salaries shall be paid from State funds; $635,651 was appropriated by the State legislature to fund this bill in FY 1975. This sum, when added to the $1,617,706 budgeted for managers' and supervisors' salaries for FY 1975, elevates State funding for the program to a level in excess of $2.25 million or an increase of about $840,000 in the past three years, due mostly to enactment of SB 582. This equates to about 15¢ per meal (lunch and breakfast) in direct State assistance to the Child Nutrition Programs. Obviously, we are pleased and proud of the degree of support given by the Governor and the State legislature to Delaware's school food service programs and believe their actions are consistent with the Federal Congress in recognizing and supporting sound school food service programs.

I hope the above information is useful to you. Thank you for asking for my views and the consideration you have given them.

Sincerely yours,

Robert L. John

Robert L. John
Supervisor, Food Service

RLJ:ehc
encl.
cc: Senator Percy
Senator Roth
Senator Biden
Representative duPont
Dr. Madden
Dr. Ryan
Mr. Durkee

SCHOOL MEAL PRICE SURVEY

School Districts	1973-74 Lunch Price (¢) H	M	E	1973-74 Breakfast Price (¢) H	M	E	1973-74 Adult Price (¢) H	M	E	1974-75 Lunch Price (¢) H	M	E	1974-75 Breakfast Price (¢) H	M	E	1974-75 Adult Price (¢) H	M	E	Difference Lunch (¢) H	M	E	Difference Breakfast (¢) H	M	E	Difference Adult (¢) H	M	E
																			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Alexis I. duPont	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	45	45	40	-	-	-	70	70	70	5	5	5	-	-	-	15	15	15
Alfred I. duPont	35	35	35	-	-	-	50	50	50	45	45	45	-	-	-	70	70	70	10	10	10	-	-	-	20	20	20
Appoquinimink	35	35	30	-	-	-	50	50	50	40	35	30	-	-	-	65	65	65	5	5	0	-	-	-	15	15	15
Caesar Rodney	45	45	40	15	15	15	60	60	60	45	45	40	15	15	15	70	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
Cape Henlopen	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	40	40	35	-	-	-	65	65	65	0	0	0	-	-	-	10	10	10
Capital	35	30	30	15	15	15	50	50	50	35	30	30	15	15	15	60	60	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
Claymont	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	45	40	35	-	-	-	70	70	70	5	0	5	-	-	-	15	15	15
Conrad Area	35	35	30	15	15	15	60	60	60	40	40	35	15	15	15	65	65	65	5	5	5	0	0	0	5	5	5
De La Warr	40	40	35	15	15	15	65	65	65	45	45	40	20	20	20	75	75	75	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	10	10
Delmar	45			-			65			45			-			70			0			-			5		
Indian River	35	35	35	-	-	-	60	60	60	35	35	35	20	20	20	60	60	60	0	0	0	New Prog.			0	0	0
Lake Forest	45	45	40	-	-	-	75	75	75	45	45	40	-	-	-	75	75	75	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0
Laurel	40	35	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	45	45	40	-	-	-	70	70	70	5	10	5	-	-	-	15	15	15
Marsh.-McKean	40	40	35	-	-	-	70	70	70	45	45	40	-	-	-	75	75	75	5	5	5	-	-	-	5	5	5
Milford	45	45	35	15	15	15	65	65	65	45	45	40	15	15	15	70	70	70	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	5	5
Mt. Pleasant	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	45	45	40	-	-	-	70	70	70	5	5	5	-	-	-	15	15	15
NC-GB	30	30	30	-	-	-	50	50	50	30	30	30	-	-	-	55	55	55	0	0	0	-	-	-	5	5	5
Newark	35	35	30	15	15	15	50	50	50	45	45	40	15	15	15	70	70	70	10	10	10	0	0	0	20	20	20
Seaford	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	45	45	40	-	-	-	70	70	70	5	5	5	-	-	-	15	15	15
Smyrna	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	50	50	50	45	-	-	-	75	75	75	10	10	10	-	-	-	20	20	25
Stanton	40	40	35	-	-	-	55	55	55	50	50	45	-	-	-	75	75	75	10	10	10	-	-	-	20	20	20
Wilmington	35	35	30	25	25	25	50	50	50	35	35	30	25	25	25	60	60	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
Woodbridge	40	40	35	-	-	-	65	65	65	45	45	40	-	-	-	70	70	70	5	5	5	-	-	-	5	5	5
N.C. Vo-Tech	45			-			60			45			-			75			0			-			15		
Kent Vo-Tech	45			-			60			45			-			70			0			-			10		
Sussex Vo-Tech	35			-			50			50			-			75			15			-			25		

H - High School
M - Middle School
E - Elementary School
- - No program

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIVISION OF LOGISTICAL SUPPORT
PRESIDENTIAL BUILDING
415 - 12TH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

FOOD SERVICES BRANCH

February 5, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
Chairman, Senate Select Committee
on Nutrition and Human Needs
New Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Sir:

In response to your telegram message 655 01-23 1133A EST, the following information is provided; answers are keyed to your questions:

1. Average Per Day:

	SCHOOLS		
	PUBLIC LUNCH	PRIVATE LUNCH	TOTAL LUNCHES
FREE	48,643	568	49,211
PAID	9,272	282	9,554

2.	LUNCH	BREAKFAST
LAST YEAR	$0.8931	$0.3048
THIS YEAR	$1.00	$0.4060

3. No increase in the price of lunch or breakfast.

4.	DECEMBER 1974	DECEMBER 1973
LUNCH	2,060	499
BREAKFAST	495	79

5. More paying students have become eligible. District Public Schools are on the reduced price program.

6. Universal Free Meal Program.

7. Participation in the breakfast program has increased at a greater percentage rate than the lunch program in the D. C. Public Schools. This is due to expansion of hot breakfast program in all cafeteria schools (103) and hot pre-plated breakfasts in satellite schools equipped with

convection ovens (total 70). Breakfast participation will take many decades to equate lunch participation. Our children are the products of a generation of nutritionally ignorant adults. Breakfast has never been emphasized in the home, nor in school. We, therefore, must place our social emphasis on eating patterns before we can equate participation in breakfast programs with that of the lunch program.

8. I personally think existing regulations are fine. However, Congress should be very cautious of the intent of USDA to eliminate the especially needy clause from the breakfast program as was done in the lunch program. Without especially needy rates, urban areas will be doomed.

9.

a. More flexibility in the serving portions required to meet the type "A" pattern would discourage waste in the lunchroom. Many children are unable to eat the same amount of food from day to day for various reasons, such as other foods consumed between meals; type of physical activity engaged in before mealtime, feeling of well-being, etc. All of these factors have a direct bearing on how hungry a child is at mealtime.

b. More flexibility in the vegetable requirement would reduce waste as well as increase participation. Eliminate the two (2) or more fruits or vegetables requirement and allow one to make a choice of one fruit, one vegetable, or both, whichever meets the food preference of the children. Food preference of the children in Washington, D. C. varies from one section of the city to another, depending on background.

c. More nutrition education for school administrators, students, and parents is definitely needed.

d. We should not force children to take food that will not be consumed simply to meet type "A" pattern. This force results in wasted food, loss of energy for food production, transportation, preparation, and also unnecessary expenditure of Federal funds.

10.

a. I would think with the cash in lieu clause, a 10¢ per meal payment would be sufficient as long as the escalation clause is in the program, we should keep pace with cost. However, consideration should now be given to combining the 10¢ commodity cash to the lunch rate so that the escalation will cause the 10¢ cash to remain proportionate with the increasing cost.

b. The District of Columbia is authorized to requisition from General Services Administration and Defense Supply Agency; therefore, we can purchase items as cheaply and of equal quality as USDA under centralized procurement. However, small or rural districts may suffer.

11.

a. Equipment needs for new programs. NFA reserved funds are more than sufficient.

b. Equipment needs for existing programs - $41,895.

c. Non-food Assistance - FY 75 Received:

Reserved - $41,895

Unreserved - $42,051

12.

		BREAKFAST	LUNCH
a.	Projection - "Universal Feeding"	[redacted]0,000-100%	111,350-68%
b.	Would favor such a program.		
c.	Additional monies needed (estimated):		
	Breakfast - $1,440,000		
	Lunch - $5,691,000		

13.

		ESTIMATED
a.	Armored Car Service	$60,000
b.	Cost of Printing Lunch Tickets	2,000
c.	Cost of Printing Application Forms	3,000
d.	Loss - Uncollected Accounts	300
e.	Personnel Cost Savings	13,700
		$79,000

Plus Intangible Savings - Would reduce the administrative workload substantially at the school level. School authorities could then devote this time to the educational needs, such as nutrition educations.

14.

A) None

B) 90%

C) None

D) None

15.		FUNDS
	Breakfast	$193,000
	Lunch	$271,000

Total amount of State Reimbursements received in FY 1975, including amounts stated above - $5,093.113.

Joseph M. Stewart, Director
Food Services Branch

JMS/KHR/apc

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TALLAHASSEE 32304

February 3, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
Chairman, Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs
The United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

The following information is in response to your telegram requesting information for your use in considering legislation:

1.

	Free	Paid	
Type A Lunches Served Per Day	308,279	494,094	(these figures do not include reduced price meals)
School Breakfasts Served Per Day	57,554	9,648	

	FY-75	FY-74
2. Lunch Cost	79.4¢	73.5¢
Breakfast Cost	41.1¢	38.8¢

3. Students price has increased over last year; on the average of 8¢ for lunch and 5¢ for breakfast.

We can correlate loss of participation among the paying students with a drop of 43,589 paid lunches per day, or a drop of 9%.

	FY-75	Increase Over FY-74 (per day)
4. Reduced price lunches	59,185	+ 25,753
Reduced price breakfasts	4,718	+ 1,993

5. Expanded reduced price program has kept the overall participation from dropping further. Sixty-three of the sixty-seven school districts participate in the reduced price program. All but one of the sixty-three districts selected to go with the 175% income scale factor.

6. See attached copies of correspondence.

7. In Florida we continue to add new breakfast programs throughout the year. We never expect to have as many breakfast programs as there are lunch programs. Impediments to the breakfast programs are:

   - "This is the family job."
   - Lack of interest and understanding on part of administrators.
   - Attitude of officials that breakfast is a welfare program.
   - Bus schedules are too tight, due to cross-bussing.
   - School food service personnel do not want to work extra hours and meals unless paid more.
   - Not safe for one woman to come to school so early in the morning to prepare breakfast. Therefore, labor cost increase with one or two additional personnel coming for safety precautions. These may be the only people on the school campus at the time they need to be there for breakfast preparation.
   - Some people still think that\a breakfast must be a hot eggs and bacon type meal. We are promoting a low labor-prepackaged cereal, fruit and milk breakfast.

   It is gratifying to hear some principals say that if they could only have one meal for service, they would choose the breakfast over the lunch!

8. We believe that the universal reduced price lunch concepts could be applied to the breakfast program.

9. Nutritionally, the meal component requirements for breakfast and lunch are minimum. It would be desirable to have alternative meal patterns with fewer food components, which could be used especially in high schools where lunch scheduling becomes a problem. These patterns would allow a lunch with variety that could be packed and served quickly to the students. These lunches could earn a lesser reimbursement than the Type A lunch. Many high schools are so overcrowded that a la carte service has become a way of life to get more students through the line. Perhaps, the nutrient-planned menus could be put to use for reimbursement purposes.

10. If the commodity program were to end, 11½¢ cash per meal would be needed to offset the loss. We feel that each State should decide whether they have a commodity program, and districts should be allowed the same choice. The Administration, however, needs to make up their minds whether there is to be price support or not.

    Outlook of foods purchased and when to be received needs to reach local personnel early so that proper plannning and utilization can be made. The U. S. Department of Agriculture needs to consider how foods are to be used and by whom, in making the purchases. For example, without the commodity flour, schools are not baking the extra cookies, bread, etc. they once did and, therefore, the peanut butter is more difficult to use.

Also, for example, the purchase of large peach halves may be wasted on small K-5 children. Sliced peaches would be better. The commodity processing contracts should be continued, as this utilizes the food products, keeps labor costs low and maintains foods standards which all benefit the child.

All in all, the commodity program is not as efficient in Florida as purchasing locally. However, our beef and citrus industries need price support by the USDA. Therefore, the Governor, not I, really should be making such a decision.

11. Equipment needs, as per Annual Plan FY-75:

	Number of Schools	Needs	Actual Allocation FY-75
(1) New Programs	15	$ 450,000	$ 391,323
(2) Existing Programs			
(a) Expansion	200	600,000	
(b) Maintenance	712	4,795,931	
(c) Improvement of Program		1,119,554	Total for (2) (a) (b) (c) $ 560,824
		$6,515,485	

12. (1) We would expect an increase in participation of from current 58% to at least 80%.

(2) Yes. See attached copies of correspondence. NOTE: Food stamps could be utilized in lieu of totally free lunches.

(3) Total additional dollars needed to fund the universal 10¢ lunch:

FY-75 Percent Sec. 4 & 11 Funds	Now Sec. 4 & 11 Funds	Add Sec. 4 and 11 Funds
$ 49,978,880	$ 143,335,800	$ 93,356,920

at 80% participation, ADP would be 1,147,421 x estimated cost of 79.4¢ x 180 days = $163,989,360 less 10¢ income of $20,653,560 = need of $143,335,800.

13. Estimate savings for 10¢ universal lunch:

206,535,780 x 3¢ per lunch, or $6,196,073 (principal's time, etc.)

14. Percent of school districts charging the lunch program for:

(A) Utilities - 8%
(B) Transportation of USDA Foods - None
(C) School Administrative Overhead - None
(D) Employment of Personnel for Supervision During Lunch - 40% (approx.)

15. State reimbursement average 6.9¢ per free and reduced price lunch; breakfast - none.

FY '73	-	6¢	per	free	and	reduced	price lunch
FY '74	-	6.5¢	"	"	"	"	" "
FY '75	-	6.9¢	"	"	"	"	" "

Current amount: $4,175,377 (Governor not recommending a continuation of this funding.)

Senator McGovern, the free provision of the Special Milk Program is very difficult to administer. So difficult, in fact, that the majority of our schools are not on the Special Milk Program. In future legislation, let's add these resources to the school lunch and breakfast programs, except in schools not having a food service.

Sincerely,

George Hockenbery

George Hockenbery
Administrator
Food and Nutrition Services

GH:ee
Encls.

STATE OF IDAHO
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LEN B. JORDAN OFFICE BUILDING
BOISE, IDAHO 83720

ROY TRUBY
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

March 10, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This is in reply to your telegram regarding the School Lunch Program and the Breakfast Program. I regret the delay in answering, but uncontrollable things happened that prevented this study to go forward. We do not administer the private schools, so this is for the public schools only.

1. Average number of paid lunches in November, 1974, was 75,418.
   Average number of free lunches in November, 1974, was 16,443.
   Average number of paid breakfasts in November, 1974, was 22.
   Average number of free breakfasts in November, 1974, was 169.

2. Estimated cost of producing a lunch in September-December, 1974, was 61 cents.
   Estimated cost of producing a lunch in September-December, 1973, was 56 cents.
   Estimated cost of producing a breakfast in September-December, 1974, was 28 cents.
   Estimated cost of producing a breakfast in September-December, 1973, was 25 cents.

3. Students' lunch price increased 5 cents over last year's price of 40 cents.
   Students' breakfast price increased 5 cents over last year's price of 15 cents.

   We cannot exactly correlate loss of participation among paying students, but we do know that as the price to the child increases, the participation drops.

4. Reduced-price lunches per day in November, 1974, was 811.
   Reduced-price lunches per day in November, 1973, was 719.
   Reduced-price breakfasts per day in November, 1974, was 1.
   Reduced-price breakfasts per day in November, 1973, was 0.

5. In Fiscal Year 1974, 29 districts started the reduced-price lunch. In Fiscal Year 1975, 26 more districts started the reduced-price lunch.

   We had an increase of 12 percent in reduced-price lunches in November, 1974, as compared to November, 1973.

6. Keep the reimbursement up high enough to ward off increase in prices to the paying child or institute an all reduced-price lunch program by larger reimbursements.

7. In the beginning, breakfast was limited to low-income areas and this image still prevails.

   We have a lot of bus students and bus schedules are geared to let the student arrive at school at the time school takes up, so little time for breakfast.

   School food service personnel have their hands full getting the lunch going. Need additional labor.

8. Change the pattern by requiring protein foods in the breakfast pattern. Money for equipment to get started.

9. Permit a dairy alternate for fluid milk just as we do with meat alternate. This would apply to breakfast too.

10. a) Loss of commodities should be replaced in cash at the rate of at least 15 cents per meal. We recommend getting the cash, but, in any event, we need either cash or commodities. I would recommend a voucher system and let the schools buy from their wholesale suppliers if USDA feels they need to control some items.

    b) I'd say that at least 90 percent of our districts can buy at a price comparable to the USDA.

11. New programs in Idaho will need $329,547.
    Existing programs will need $106,107.
    We will receive $23,027 this Fiscal Year for non-program schools.
    We will receive $56,107 this Fiscal Year for existing schools.

12. I would favor a universal reduced-price lunch in order to eliminate so many of the headaches of administration as well as reach more children. A few years ago we reimbursed several districts enough that they could reduce the charge to 10 cents and almost all the kids paid the 10 cents and ate. The free lunches dropped because parents said "the price is low enough that we can afford to pay and we want to pay the same price as everyone else."

    In Fiscal Year 1974, we served 15,702,034 lunches and paid $1,614,310.30 at the rate of 10 cents. If we were to drop the price 20 cents (from 45 cents to 25 cents), we would need an additional $3,140,406.80 (20 cents times meals served).

30-215 O - 75 -- 4

13. I don't believe we would save any money because present staff have assumed this overbearing task as an additional headache. It would free our people from a menial detail and let them get back to making a productive contribution toward improving the overall program; and, in the case of principals and teachers, it would let them do the work they were employed to do.

14. a) Utilities - 0.
    b) Transportation of USDA foods - 100 percent.
    c) School administrative overhead - 15 percent.
    d) Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period - 15 percent.

15. State reimbursement per lunch for Fiscal Year 1975 is 1 cent.
    State reimbursement per breakfast for Fiscal Year 1975 is 0.

    This rate has doubled during the past three years for lunches.
    Total State reimbursement for Fiscal Year 1975 is $181,500.

We thank you for your interest in the Child Nutrition Programs.

Very truly yours,

Cecil F. Olsen

CECIL F. OLSEN, Director
Food Services Branch

CFO:lb

ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Springfield, Illinois 62706

February 5, 1975

JOSEPH M. CRONIN
State Superintendent
of Education

The Honorable George McGovern
Chairman
Select Committee on
Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

In response to your telegram of January 23, 1975, we have listed our answers in the same sequence as shown in the telegram:

1. Average daily paid, reduced, and free lunches and breakfasts served in Illinois in 1973 and 1974.

LUNCHES	Nov. 1973	Nov. 1974
Paid	582,585	551,286
Reduced Price	522	4,490
Free	371,713	374,552
Total	954,820	930,328

Breakfasts	Nov. 1973	Nov. 1974
Paid	2,152	2,480
Reduced Price	-0-	279
Free	32,911	34,479
Total	35,063	37,238

The significant change in the lunch program is the overall daily decline of 24,492 lunches which are entirely in the paid lunch group. However, total school enrollment statewide is declining at the rate of about 50,000 students annually. Therefore, the proportion of overall participation to total enrollment has remained about constant.

2. Average food cost for the Type A lunch, based on October, November, and December 1974 data.

Estimated Food Cost	$.401
Estimated Total Type A Meal Cost	.80
Breakfast cost figure not available	

3. Student price increase.

Lunch	Approximately $.05 per lunch
Breakfast	No change

4. Number of reduced price meals daily.

	Nov. 1973	Nov. 1974
Lunch	522	4,490
Breakfast	210	279

5. Effect of reduced price lunch.

	Nov. 1973	Nov. 1974
Number of districts with reduced price lunches	3	123

6. Legislative changes recommended to increase participation by paying student.

Increase basic reimbursement for all Type A meals served at least five (5) cents, thereby allowing the Type A lunch to continue being the best food buy for all children.

7-9. I don't believe additional legislation or reimbursement rates are the only needs to improve lunch and breakfast program participation. Rather, like all Child Nutrition Programs, expansion is retarded by too many regulations. Stealing from commercialism, "Are we easy to do business with?" The answer, of course, is "No." Present funding levels for State Administrative Expenses from the United States Department of Agriculture provide only a pittance necessary to properly help school officials conduct the programs. Compare, for example, the staffing, coverage, consultation, and fiscal management service of a food management firm or commercial food service chain operations to what can be offered by the State Agency.

Practically all Federally funded programs other than the United States Department of Agriculture allow at least 10 percent for the state to provide an adequate administrative staff. We currently receive less than one-third of one percent. I see the basic problem of expansion of programs rooted in lack of knowledge. School educational administrators are not trained or experienced in the cold, hard, dollar-and-cents world of business operations, particularly in the area of volume, quality food service merchandising. Therefore, the burden of advice and consultation falls entirely upon the State Agency.

Only when the State Agency can provide the necessary service to relieve the educational administrator of an unknown operational factor, Child Nutrition Programs, can we expect extensive program expansion. Then we will be "easy to do business with." Once the operational and fiscal burden is under control, the Nutrition Education programs can be implemented. We must make operations attractive to the students, get them in the lunchroom, before Nutrition Education can become a reality. The students are our customers; they can't be made to wait in line 10 to 15 minutes to get lunch; they don't have to wait at the corner Burgerbigees.

10.

A. If the food commodity program were discontinued, the cash necessary to truly replace the purchasing power or equivalent value would be at least 25 percent over the present rate, from 10 cents per meal to at least 12.5 cents. However, I feel the commodity program should continue, with additional input from the State Agency and operating personnel as to types of food purchased.

B. In my opinion, no school lunch program, other than some of the major cities' programs, have the technical know-how or volume to obtain the quality and quantity per dollar that the USDA can. The main problem in local school purchasing is specifications, not just having specifications but evaluating them, testing incoming deliveries and finally, on small, normal school orders, wholesale grocers won't be bothered bidding against detailed specifications. In some areas, school board policy requires local buying preference, which further inhibits economical buying practice. There is really no way of comparing items because of specification differences. For example, USDA ground beef has a specific allowable fat and component content. How do you compare this price per pound against a price per pound with an unknown fat and component content?

11. The equipment needs for new programs are keyed to what happens in the areas discussed in questions 7,8,and 9. The basic problem in the Nonfood Assistance Program is again the complicated way the USDA regulations are written. There should be no restriction on funds between new programs and ongoing programs. The State Agencies should be allowed to grant assistance where it is needed.

    This year's allocation for FY 75 is $1,340,862 in Restricted funds (new programs) and for renewal and assistance to ongoing programs, $565,661.

12. If there are no further increases in the cost of food and labor, I believe a universal reduced sc[illegible] lunch program at ten cents each per meal would result in about an [illegible]0 percent statewide participation. With a ten-cent program, I would eliminate the free lunch aspect. With a flat rate of ten cents per meal, a tremendous amount of paper and administrative work would be eliminated, a step forward in making the program "easier to do business with." The comparative costs would be as shown below for November 1974:

LUNCHES

Paid	551,286 x	=	
Reduced Price	4,480 x .425	=	$ 1,908.25
Free	374,552 x .525	=	196,639.80
All Type A Lunches	930,328 x .1175	=	109,313.54
Total daily current cost		=	$307,861.59
times 176 days		=	$54,183,639.84

Proposed 10-cent reduced universal program

1,800,000 lunches x 60 cents each reimbursement
= $1,080,000 per day x 176 operating days
= $190,080,000 annual cost

However, state contribution ratio should be reviewed in light of the universal reduced price program. Student payment could be the state contribution under a universal reduced price program.

13. Under the present Free and Reduced Price Meal and Milk Programs, I estimate that it takes 6 million sheets of paper annually in Illinois for guidelines, letters to parents, and applications. Add postage and printing, this phase would cost an average of 5 cents per sheet, or $300,000 annually.

    Claim for reimbursement forms could be simplified as well as computer time and programming. All together, I would estimate the total saving would amount to about half a million dollars annually.

14. The percentage of school districts' charges to the lunch programs for:

    A. Utilities: Estimate 50 percent
    B. Transportation of USDA foods: 100 percent
    C. School administrative overhead: Estimate 20 percent
    D. Employment of personnel for supervision during lunch period: Estimate 10 percent

    We are just beginning full program cost accounting training for school officials.

15. The current level of the State of Illinois reimbursement for Child Nutrition Programs is based on the Free Lunch and/or Breakfast provided to an eligible needy child at the rate of 15 cents each. The current FY 75 State appropriation for this program is $11,500,000. The rate has remained the same for the past three years.

If we may be of any further assistance to you or the Committee, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

R. E. Ohlzen

Robert E. Ohlzen
Director
School Food Services

REO:mt
cc: The Honorable Boyd R. Bucher
Dr. Robert G. Weber
Dr. John Perryman
R.J.Nelson
Emmett Slingsby
Bill D. Page

STATE OF IOWA • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
GRIMES STATE OFFICE BUILDING • DES MOINES, IOWA 50319

ROBERT D. BENTON, Ed.D., STATE SUPERINTENDENT
David H. Bechtel, M.S., Administrative Assistant
RICHARD N. SMITH, Ph.D., DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT

March 12, 1975

Senator George McGovern
Chairman
U. S. Senate Select Committee on
Nutrition and Human Needs
The United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This is in reply to your telegram of January 23rd requesting certain information regarding child nutrition programs in Iowa. Information includes both public and nonpublic schools unless otherwise stated.

1. January, 1974, ADP:

Lunches	Total ADP	425,683
	Paid ADP	357,703
	Free ADP	58,589
Breakfast	Total ADP	7,551
	Paid ADP	3,866
	Free ADP	3,574

2. Average cost of producing lunch this year:

July through December, 70.1¢ plus 10¢ commodities = 80.1¢ compared with 69.4¢ plus 8.1¢ commodities = 77.5¢ for period of July 73 through June 74. Increase of 2.6¢ = 3.35%.

Average cost of producing breakfast this year:

July through December, 38.9¢ plus 3¢ commodities = 41.9¢ compared with 33.2¢ plus 2¢ commodities = 35.2¢ for period of July 73 through June 74. Increase of 6.7¢ = 19.03%.

3. Students' prices have increased for both lunches and breakfasts:

Lunch,	Sept. 73,	40.87¢.	Sept. 74, 42.98¢	+ 5.16%
Bkfst,	Sept. 73,	13.14¢.	Sept. 74, 14.12¢	+ 7.46%

Because of starting to administer nonpublic schools on July 1, 1974, we do not have exact correlation of participation when comparing this year's to last.

We can report, however, that percentage of participation for Iowa's

public schools last school year was 68.65% compared with 71.71% for this year to date. Total participation has increased 4.46% so far this school year.

For public schools, paid ADP (Sept through January, 1974) was 331,067 compared with 329,075 for same period this school year. This represents a decrease of 1,992 per day = 0.6%. It must be kept in mind that public school enrollment, reported to our office, decreased 2.5% during this same period.

4. January, 1974, ADP:

Lunches Reduced Price ADP for Jan, 1974: 9,391
Bkfst Reduced Price ADP for Jan, 1974: 111

Public R/P ADP Jan, 1974 was 3,049 compared with Jan, 1973 of 8404 equals increase of 175%.

5. Number of reduced price lunches in Iowa has more than doubled. Forty-eight school districts initiated reduced price meals this year. Sixty-five percent of school districts now offer reduced price meals. Seventy-eight percent of school enrollment are offered reduced price lunches.

6. None to recommend at this time.

7. Possibly attitude that is family's responsibility.

8. None to recommend at this time.

9. Nothing specific to recommend except that minimum requirements should not be abandoned.

10. A. Ten cents. We want the commodity program to continue. Only change that should be considered would be in flour and cooking oils and this should be carefully considered and more carefully worded. This present year has been a very good commodity year for schools.

B. Assuming equal quality, it is our opinion that most schools cannot purchase as economically.

11. NFA is spread out to be considered adequate. Reserve, $54,466. Unreserved, $263,224.

12. Possibly would increase 20%. Such a program would appeal to middle and upper income brackets. First priority should be given to continuing present programs. Universal program should be considered. Estimate an additional $35 to$40 million would be needed.

13. Estimate (only): Would save much time--possibly 350 to 400,000 work hours per year for the state. This might equal up to $1,000,000 in potential savings to lunch programs. This is difficult to estimate.

14. A. Estimate up to 25%.
B. 100%.
C. Estimate 1%.
D. Estimate 5%.

15.

	Current	3 years ago	% Increase
Type A Lunches	.99¢	.33¢	+ 200.0%
Free Lunches	4.48¢	2.36¢	+ 89.8%
R/P Lunches	3.57¢	1.18¢	+ 202.5%
Breakfasts	.79¢	.88¢	- 11.4%
Free Bkfst	2.00¢	--	+ 200.0%
R/P Bkfst	1.49¢	--	+ 149.0%

FY 75 State Appropriation $1,350,000

Respectfully submitted,

Vern Carpenter

Vern Carpenter, Director
Child Nutrition Programs Division

VC:nam

STATE OF GEORGIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ATLANTA 30334

JACK P. NIX
State Superintendent of Schools

S. CAL ADAMSON
Associate State Superintendent

February 17, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
United States Senator
Room 362
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

The following data concerning Child Nutrition Programs in response to your request:

State: GEORGIA

1. Meals served daily (October, 1974):

	Paid	Free	Reduced	Total
Lunch	471,598	337,727	22,017	831,342
Breakfast	8,691	52,346	1,995	63,032

2. Estimated cost of producing:

	1974-75	1973-75
Lunch	66	58
Breakfast	31	25

3. The student price increased in most schools an average of 5¢ per meal. A comparison of the average daily number of paid lunches:

1973-74 - 491,958
1974-75 - 471,598
20,360

4. Reduced price meals:

	Lunch	Breakfast
October, 1973	13,295	797
October, 1974	22,017	1,995

5. Impact of expanded reduced price policy:

8,722 more children are participating in the reduced lunch program and 802 more children are participating in the breakfast program.

6. Legislative changes proposed:

Increase Section 4 funds to support a 35¢ reimbursement for paid meals; this should bring sale price down to 25-30 cents which would be within reach of most paying children or better still provide legislation for a Universal Reduced Price for paying children; retain no cost meals for poor children.

7. Why has Breakfast Program growth been slow?

All the factors mentioned affect decisions about school breakfast.

8. Changes that would help expand breakfast:

Increase level of Section 4 funds for lunches in schools which operate breakfast programs. Provide a monetary incentive to school lunch. Many administrators have the notion that breakfast costs must be absorbed by school lunch.

Another thing to help breakfast would be to allow breakfast to be served at any time during the school day as long as it is the first meal served at school.

9. Suggested modifications in meal pattern:

I would recommend that the nutrient approach be permitted as an alternative to the Type A pattern.

10. Commodities:

A. Discontinuing the commodity program is not a reasonable alternative.

Legislation is needed which will assure the states that commodities will be continued at least at the rate of 7¢ worth per meal. Legislation is also needed to require USDA to provide grains and oils to states which can use these.

To improve the commodity program, food service directors should have some input into types and kinds of food. Improvements are needed in information regarding delivery and also in frequency and quantity of delivery.

B. Comparison of prices:

	USDA Price Range	Local System 1/
Frozen Ground Beef	67-69¢	89¢ - Dec.
Frozen Franks	.65 - .657	79¢ - Jan.
Cut-up chicken	49-52¢	69¢

The comparison shows that USDA can buy for less.

1/ These prices were bid prices in Clayton County (Jonesboro, Ga.). The school system serves 24,000 meals daily.

11. Equipment Needs

1. Georgia will receive $531,000 for Nonfood Assistance in existing schools and $80,000 for expansion.

2. Georgia schools would easily use one million in Nonfood Assistance funds if available and USDA did not establish restrictive criteria.

12. Increased participation if a Universal Program was established.

I expect participation would increase to 90% or 7% over the present program. Since school lunch sale prices have advanced, the participation has dropped from nearly 86% to 82%.

I personally would not favor a program that would take lunches at no cost from poor children. For many of the recipients of free meals, whose families are on food stamps, there is no cash to pay even 10¢.

I would recommend some change that would preclude the voluminous application procedure which is now required.

Based on 1973-74 data, it would have cost an additional million dollars to provide free lunches to all children.

13. Savings with Universal:

Information not available. However, it is my best estimate that millions in direct costs would be saved nationally. Considering teacher time used in getting lunch counts, etc. The following estimate of savings in Georgia is projected:

Teacher time (5 minutes per day) (35,714 teachers)	$2,142,720
Approval time at beginning of year (80 hours per school)	576,000
Supplies (paper, stamps)	100,000
School Food Service (10 minutes per day)	200,000
SAVINGS	$3,018,720

Additional savings would be realized as a result of increased volume and lower operating costs.

14. Indirect costs:

A. Utilities - Most systems pay utilities at present. Some USDA attitudes toward certain aspects of full cost accounting could reverse this trend.

B. USDA Foods - Most systems pay.
C. Administrative Overhead - Most systems pay.
D. Supervision During School Lunch Period - Teachers or teacher aides supervise.

15. State Funds

	Lunch	Breakfast	Total
1972-73	2 1/2¢	0	3.86 million
1973-74 1/	4 1/2¢	0	6.74 million
1974-75 2/	5¢	0	7.3 million

The legislature has never provided any funds for breakfast. Federal funds are very adequate as long as we can keep the "needy provision."

I wish to thank you for your continued interest in and support of School Food Service.

Sincerely yours,

Josephine

Josephine Martin, Chairman
Legislative Committee
American School Food Service Association

Administrator, School Food Service
Georgia Department of Education

JM:pe

1/ Was increased to 5¢ in April, 1973

2/ General Assembly is proposing to increase 1974-75 rate to 6¢ for last 50 days of the school year and to 7¢ for 1975-76.

STATE OF HAWAII

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P. O. BOX 2360

HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

OFFICE OF BUSINESS SERVICES

January 28, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
Member of Congress
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

In response to your wire of January 23rd, may I respond to the questions as they apply to the public schools in the single, statewide school district of Hawaii.

1) Lunches - Paid: 113,833 Free: 21,063 Total: 134,896 November
Breakfasts - Paid: 510 Free: 1,847 Total: 2,357 averages

2) Lunch Costs - FY 1974: 72.3¢ FY 1975: 81.9¢
Breakfast Costs - FY 1974: 27.1¢ FY 1975: 29.18¢

3) No increase in charge to students. Breakfast - 10¢; Lunch - 25¢. Participation has increased. ADP Lunch - 83%.

4) No reduced price breakfasts or lunches served.

5) N/A

6) Sound economic program that will stop and turn inflation downward and thus permit lowering price charged student.

7) Breakfast at school has competition. Many students do have breakfast at home. And, where breakfast is served before the start of school, the students elect to play outside rather than go into the school for breakfast.

8) Increased funding would permit greater menu variety. However, comparison of breakfast/lunch participation may not be an effective measure of the BP.

9) Plate waste in the lunch program results in large measure from the student's lack of choice at the serving counter. Many demonstrate their need to have a choice by not eating everything on the Type A tray. Particularly at the secondary level, there is a sex to plate waste. In our studies, males discarded 80% of the fruit/vegetable plate waste; females discarded 80% of the bread/starch plate waste.

By permitting the student to omit a single Type A component at the serving counter (without reducing level of reimbursement) we could help assure that food served was consumed. It is an utter waste of food and funds to serve mashed potatoes to a student we know will throw it out -- we do not do it in our homes; we should not do it in our schools.

Admittedly, a wider choice of Type A components on the serving line might help correct the situation; but as schools attempt to serve 1000, 2000 or even 3000 students in an hour or less, there is not time to offer choices and serve quickly.

10) A. WE WOULD GLADLY ACCEPT CASH IN LIEU OF COMMODITIES AT THE 10¢ LEVEL. CASH WOULD PERMIT BETTER PLANNING, HENCE GREATER CONTROL. CASH WOULD PERMIT THE PURCHASE OF FOODS MORE SUITABLE FOR OUR MENUS.

WE STRONGLY URGE YOUR SUPPORT IN OUR EFFORTS AS WE SEEK FOR HAWAII (OR ANY STATE) THE OPTION TO RECEIVE CASH IN LIEU OF COMMODITIES. THIS FLEXIBILITY HAS BEEN GRANTED TO A SINGLE STATE, AND WE SUGGEST IT SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE SISTER STATES.

10) B. THE GREATER CONTROL THROUGH PLANNING, THE ADDED SUPPORT TO LOCAL AGRICULTURE AND THE PURCHASE OF FOODS THAT WOULD BE MOST EFFECTIVELY USED, ALL COMBINE TO ASSURE THAT HAWAII WOULD RECEIVE VALUE AT LEAST AT THE LEVEL OF USDA PURCHASE PROGRAM.

11) With all public schools in NSLP our equipment needs are minimal compared to other states. I personally would advocate NFA being limited to no-program schools.

12) Availability of 10¢ lunch might increase Hawaii's statewide participation from 83% to 93% at an estimated increase of $3.75 million federal funds for Hawaii.

By maintaining our present 25¢ charge and receiving an additional $2.5 million (10¢ per meal) federal funds, we believe the improved menu variety would result in the same 10% increase.

13) Probably none. I'm afraid the increased federal funds for Universal Lunch would result in greater federal supervision, reporting, and auditing.

14) The single statewide school district charges Utilities, Transportation of Commodities to the program. Not charged: administrative overhead and lunchroom supervision.

15) State general fund now averaging 25c per meal. General Fund at level to meet program needs after federal funds and children's payments are considered. FY 1973 GF level 20.2c. FY 75 total $7.5 million (estimate).

Cordially,

STANLEY W. DOUCETTE, DIRECTOR
SCHOOL LUNCH SERVICES

SWD/a

50-215 O - 75 -- 5

Kansas State Department of Education

Kansas State Education Building

120 East 10th Street Topeka, Kansas 66612

February 3, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
2313 New Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

We are pleased to be asked to provide data for your consideration in up-coming legislation for the Child Nutrition Programs. Your leadership in this area has certainly benefitted the Programs.

In Kansas we particularly appreciate your collaboration with Senator Dole in making it possible for us to distribute cash in lieu of commodities.

In Kansas, all programs, both public and non-public or parochial, are administered from the State Department of Education. They all operate under the same guidelines and receive the same rates of reimbursement and receive the same assistance from the agency personnel. At this time statistical data is not separated, however, when the automated data processing system is operating on schedule this data should be availabe.

To answer your specific questions:

1. Average daily participation

paid	229,009
free	50,030
reduced	8,793
total	287,832

total breakfast	7,513
free breakfast	3,354

2. Median cost of preparation

	breakfast	lunch
1974	21¢	not available
1975	25¢	.7105*

*This includes 10¢ cash in lieu of commodities.

3. Student price average

	breakfast	lunch
1974	10¢	45¢
1975	15¢	50¢

Open noon hours and dining room atmosphere seem to cause greatest loss of participation. Student prices range from 35¢ to 70¢. Elementary schools average 5¢ less than the high school in the same districts.

Participation has increased, particularly in the numbers of reduced price meals.

4 and 5--Reduced price lunches for the period...

July - December, 1973	25,718
July - December, 1974	694,605

Out of 410 sponsors only 33 do not offer reduced price meals.

6. I do not believe participation should be mandated by legislation.

Participation is a reflection of the effectiveness of consumer education and of nutrition and health education. Dining room discipline is likewise a reflection of overall school attitude and discipline.

Dining rooms must be updated in decor and atmosphere in keeping with other architectural and style changes in modern schools.

Speed-line service and too-short lunch periods are not relaxing. Long tables and benches are not inviting. Too often dining room supervision gives the feeling of "hurry up and eat and get out of here".

7. Breakfast program participation has lagged because of administrative reluctance, and lack of public information. School administrators are not facing reality when they think that breakfast is a family affair. When both parents work, no one is home to prepare breakfast. Few enjoy breakfast alone.

The meaning of breakfast is changing from a "morning meal with the family" to "food consumed while dressing or enroute".

Very few schools in Kansas have declined breakfast programs because of employee work load. In fact, some programs have been started in order to utilize staff for better production ratios.

8 and 9--I think breakfast participation would be greater with a two component nutritional supplement similar to that reimbursed for in Day Care centers. Many students do not want both a ½ pint carton of milk and ½ cup of juice.

The reimbursement rates for breakfast are more than adequate for the usual continental breakfast.

There needs to be an anti-waste compaign. With various shortages, pollution, and ecology programs, students should become aware of wasteful practices, and their costs.

10 (a) The 10¢ per meal cash-in-lieu of commodities has offset the loss of commodities.

States should have the option of commodities or cash.

(b) I am enclosing a fact sheet from one of the district food service supervisors. Several supervisors have indicated that they could buy to a better advantage because of the extra cash available. They buy only in quantities for which they have adequate storage and only those products needed for menus planned.

They do not buy tons of weiners just before school is out, which USDA did. Grapefruit juice was a drag on the market so USDA purchased it. The quantities in which USDA purchased benefits the producer, yes, but hurts the general public by causing price boosts.

11. Kansas allocation for non-food assistance for new programs is $66,000; for unreserved funds is $176,000.

If the Coffeyville school system decides to provide food service for an additional 10 centers I would be about $100,000 short for new programs.

12. Because of the paper work involved with the implementation of the Free and Reduced Price Policy such as applications and efforts to protect the anonymity of recipients, most administrators would favor a universal program.

20¢ meal charge to the child
15¢ contributed from state and local funds
20¢ per meal reimbursement--Section 4
20¢ per meal for free child--Section 11
10¢ cash for commodities

This would be my recommendation for allocation of funds. Free lunches should be available only to those hardship cases where families are not eligible for welfare but are suffering a temporary shortage of funds.

Based on the projections for the remainder of this year this allocation of fund sources would be as follows with a 2% overall increase in participation projection.

FY 1976 projection	FY 1975 estimate at current rates.
Section 4 @ 20¢--10,569,191	5,883,285
Section 11 @ 20¢-- 5,180,976	5,234,553
CFC @ 10¢-- 5,284,595	5,180,976

13. At the State Agency level, elimination of the Policy would save a minimum of 160 man days now required for preparation, typing, duplication, mailing, receiving, approving, returning, recording, and filing. In addition there are reams of paper and postage costs. This amounts to $11,500

For most schools 5 sheets of paper are needed for a letter to parents, application notification of action, etc. This requires 4500 reams of paper state wide or $13,000.

With 1700 attendance centers, each requiring a minimum of

one hour per day to provide "accountability" and to protect "anonymity" costs more than a million dollars state wide per year.

It is indeed unfortunate that it has taken this Policy implementation with all its costs and irritations to get school administrators to feed the kids who have been eligible all the time for free meals according to the Agreements. There is no question that money talks.

14. All participating schools are required by state statute to report all costs attributable to food service and to pay all program costs from the food service fund.

15. State reimbursement for lunches served this FY will be about 1.7¢ each. This is the same as last year.

Matching money for FY '74 was $860,000
FY '75 is $945,000
FY '76 projected $1,450,000

The meal cost accountability and tying the Section 11 reimbursement rate to the cost of providing the meal are very desirable. Many schools will not receive full reimbursement because of skimpy meals and underpaid cooks. Bad management should not be rewarded but neither should the kids be short-changed.

Sincerely yours,

Ione H. George, Director
School Food Services

enclosure
md
cc Senator Dole
Dr. Whittier
T. William Goodwin
Dan McNeely-Legislative Chairman-KSFSA
Miriam Cade-President-KSFSA

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LOUIS J. MICHOT
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
P. O. BOX 44064
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804

February 14, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
The United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This letter is in response to your telegram concerning Louisiana's USDA Food Services Programs. Our responses to your list of questions are attached.

We are extremely interested in three major issues: (1) Special Milk Program Regulations, (2) Commodity Program continuation, and (3) the Universal Free Lunch Program. The regulations currently governing the Special Milk Program, especially free milk, have resulted in a 60% decrease in this program in Louisiana for FY75. These regulations must be amended to make the program more attractive to local school district administrators.

The Food Distribution Program must be continued at ever increasing funding levels. Even the cash in lieu of commodities is not as attractive as the commodities themselves because of the better purchasing position of the USDA. The regulations governing this program should be amended so as to allow the USDA to purchase those food items which can be effectively utilized by the Food Services Programs.

Perhaps the greatest innovation in the Food Service Programs will be the realization of the Universal Free Lunch Program. There is no doubt that this change would remove much of the present record-keeping and allow the program to become more steamlined and effective. Louisiana had one of the first State supported school feeding programs in the Nation; Louisiana was the first State to have 100% of its public schools participate in the School Lunch Program; Louisiana was the first State to require school lunchroom managers to complete proficiency requirements for State registration; and Louisiana is among the leaders in State financial contributions to the Food Service Programs. In keeping with these accomplishments Louisiana would like to be among the first states to implement the Universal Free Lunch Program. If the Universal Free Lunch Program is initiated on a pilot basis, Louisiana would certainly like to be among the pilot states.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to express our opinions and needs relative to the future of the Food Service Programs and for your continued efforts on behalf of school children everywhere.

Sincerely,

Ronald W. Carriere
State Director
Local School System Services

RWC:LJM:ejp

Enclosure

STATE OF LOUISIANA

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your state each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month).

	Lunch	Breakfast
Daily Average Served	346,855	12,600
Daily Average Free	390,069	74,521
Total	736,924	87,121

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your state of producing a lunch this year? A Breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

	Lunch	Breakfast
Average meal cost, 1973-74	.6708	.2799
Average estimated meal cost, 1974-75	.7380	.3079

3. Has the Students' price increased per lunch over last year? Per Breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so what is it?

There has been no significant price increase to the paying students during 1974-75; however, there were price increases during the 1973-74 school year. These increases resulted in a significant loss of participation among paying students - a loss which was not recovered during the school year.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

	Lunch	Breakfast
Daily Average, reduced, 1973-74	0	0
Daily Average, reduced, 1974-75	1,750	150

5. What has been the effect of the expanded Reduced Price Program on participation in your state? How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunches this year?

Although seventeen (17) school districts have initiated the reduced price program this school year, there has been no noticeable effect on participation.

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

The implementation of the "universal free lunch" program would be the logical change.

7. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the Lunch Program. Why has program participation lagged - funding? Administrative problems? Lack of public information? School food personnel overloaded? The "This is the family job" attitude?

The School Breakfast Program regulations must be amended to permit the program to operate on the same basis as the National School Lunch Program.

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the Breakfast Program?

See Answer to Question 7.

9. What, if any, modifications in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the Lunch Program? The Breakfast Program?

Allow deviation from the Type A Lunch and Breakfast menu requirements. These deviations should be justified by each State Agency and approved by USDA.

10. A) If the Commodity Program were to end how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? Do you want the Commodity Program to continue? If so, how would you improve it or change it?

The school districts would need approximately fifteen cents (15¢) per meal in cash to replace the commodities they presently receive. We definitely desire the Commodity Program to continue as it presently operates.

B) In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

No, especially for the three food groups mentioned. The recent price differential on Whole Turkeys was approximately 13¢ per pound in the favor of the USDA.

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your State if the School Lunch Program were to be made universal, at 10 cents per lunch for all students? Under such a program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your State?

Louisiana does not favor such a program; only the true "universal free lunch program" would be acceptable.

14. What percent of the school districts in your State charge the lunch program for the cost of: a) Utilities? b) Transportation of USDA foods? c) School Administrative overhead? d) Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period?

A). Utilities?

All

B). Transportation of USDA foods?

The State Agency transports USDA foods free of charge to the school district.

C). School Administrative overhead?

All

D). Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period?

None. This is not allowed by State Policy.

15. What, if any, are the current levels of State reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three (3) years? What is the total amount of State money you currently receive?

The Louisiana State Legislature has an opened-end appropriation for the reimbursement for lunches at the rate of nine cents (9¢) per lunch. There is no state reimbursement for breakfasts. The lunch reimbursement has not been increased since 1971. The State appropriation for FY75 for this reimbursement is $11,556,822. The State also appropriates $324,270 annually for a "cost-of-living" salary adjustment for school food service personnel.

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 8717, BWI AIRPORT
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21240

February 4, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

Please find attached the answers to the telegram which was received on January 27, 1975. We appreciate your interest and support in the feeding of children. It is our understanding that President Ford has not included in his budget funding for the Breakfast Program, Special Milk Program, and the Special Food Service Program for Children.

We urgently request you and your colleaques to do all that you can to continue the School Breakfast Program and the year-round Special Food Service Program.

Thank you for helping us protect the health and well being of the nation's children.

Sincerely,

Ruthetta L. Gilgash

Ruthetta L. Gilgash
Coordinator of the
Food Services Program

RLG/sc

Attachments

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S RESPONSE TO
TELEGRAM SENT BY SENATOR McGOVERN--January 23, 1975

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your State each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month).

Number of lunches served daily:- FY 1975
Free-- 130,990
Paid-- 209,723

Number of breakfast served daily: - FY 1975
Free-- 10,707
Paid-- 3,573

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your State of producing a lunch this year? A breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

	1974 FY	1975 FY
Estimate average cost of Lunch	71¢	79¢
Estimate average cost of Breakfast	40.9¢	47.4¢

3. Has the students' price increased per lunch over last year? Per breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so, what is it?

	1974 FY	1975 FY
Lunch	10 out of 24	18 out of 24
Breakfast	1 out of 11	3 out of 13

The average increase was 5¢ for both breakfast and lunch.

The school systems which increased the cost of the lunch showed a decrease in participation among the paying children from zero to 5%.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

	1974 FY	1975 FY
Lunch	3,765	13,606
Breakfast	140	701

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation in your State? How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunches this year?

The expanded reduced price program has made a nutritious meal available to more children at a cost of 10¢ in Maryland.

School systems offered reduced meals (24 school systems in the State of Maryland)

1974 FY	1975 FY
7	19

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

A recommended change would be an increased reimbursement rate for paid meals that would allow a substantial reduction to the child. A pilot program was conducted in one of our school systems in which the price of the meal was at least 15¢ lower. In these schools we had approximately a 20% increase in participation among the paying children. The School Food Service Section in the Maryland State Department of Education offers strong support to universal feeding.

7. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the Lunch Program. Why has program participation lagged funding? Administrative problems? Lack of public information? School Food Personnel overloaded? The "This is the family job" attitude?

In the State of Maryland, the breakfast program has expanded from 226 schools in fiscal 1974 to 260 schools in fiscal 1975. Two out of 24 school systems have a breakfast program in all schools.

The main problem for expansion of the breakfast program lies in the administration of it; namely, bus scheduling, supervision of dining area and time for breakfast before classes begin. In some instances there is a feeling that the breakfast program is for the "poor" pupils.

The School Breakfast Program is becoming one of our most important programs. Eventhough the expansion may seem slow, the administrators are beginning to understand the great impact this program has on the alertness of students.

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program?

I believe the changes needed for expansion of breakfast program is on the local rather than the federal level. The greater emphasis is needed on the local level for nutrition education for teachers and students.

9. What, if any, modifications in meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? The breakfast program?

In my opinion, it is not the meal patterns that needs modification. We need to merchandise the meals, produce appetizing, appealing food and team this with the understanding of the value of food to the health and well being of the student. Also, needed is emphasis on the learning to eat a variety of foods other than snack items.

In addition to extending nutrition education to the students, training of school lunch personnel is another area which will help to upgrade the employee to a greater awareness of good preparation techniques and appearance of food.

10. SEE ATTACHED.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? For existing programs? How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

In the State of Maryland there are 361 no program schools all of which are non-public schools. Of this number, 15 are Special Education Schools and 55 nursery and/or kindergarten schools. In our State, kindergarten is part of the minimum program of education and therefore, a kindergarten school is counted. Many of our nonprogram schools are parochial and boarding schools, and do not seem to have an interest in participating in the federal programs.

Therefore, the amount of equipment money for new programs has not been used for the past two years, and does not appear that we will be using the equipment money for new schools in fiscal 1975. The equipment need for this present fiscal year is estimated to be approximately $400,000.00. We expect to receive Nonfood Assistance money for unrestricted use of our existing programs in the amount of $206,501.00. Under the restricted (new programs) nonfood assistance funds, we expect to receive $219,479.00.

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your State if the school lunch program were to be made universal, at 10 cents per lunch for all students? Under such a program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your State?

We are not in favor of charging all children 10¢ per lunch as this would still necessitate an exchange of money. It appears that it would not be a sound practice to ask the student who has been receiving a free meal to then pay for the meal. Our experience is that only 1/10 of the students receiving free and reduced price lunches are participating in the reduced price lunch program.

An estimate is projected that 90% of the children would participate in a lunch program at no cost.

We estimate that approximately an additional $90 million per year would be needed for a universal free lunch program.

13. How much time and money would your State save if a universal program replaced the current program, and the current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly?

We do not have any statistics to prove our theory, but we feel that if the value of the time spent by administrators and teachers would be coupled with the amount of money spent for food other than in the school lunch program, and the cost to the parent for the purchase of a meal at school or a meal brought from home, it would offset the total cost of the universal lunch program. The frustration level of the administrator in attempting to avoid overt identification is extremely high. This has been paramounted with the initiation of the Special Milk Program offering a free milk to children eligible for free meals. One of our greatest concerns is to find some method to relieve the principal and the teacher of this frustration.

14. What percent of the school districts in your State charge the lunch program for the cost of:

A) Utilities? 8%

B) Transportation of USDA foods? 13%

C) School Administrative Overhead? Zero

D) Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period?

It is estimated that about 20% of our school systems pay for the employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period.

15. What, if any, are the current levels of State reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three years? What is the total amount of State money you currently receive?

We are currently receiving $4 million from State funds for free and reduced price meals. In fiscal 1971 the maximum paid for a free meal was 18¢ from State funds. For the past several years, the maximum rate of reimbursement from State funds has remained at 15¢.

State of Minnesota

Department of Education
Capitol Square, 550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

February 13, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Senate
Room 301, Senate Annex
Washington, D.C. 20250

Dear Sir:

In response to your telegram survey dated January 23rd, the Minnesota State Agency is herein replying to each of the survey's questions regarding the National School Lunch Program, the School Breakfast Program and the Commodity Distribution Program.

1. An average of 473,703 paid-for lunches (including 23,180 adult meals) and 90,391 free meals were served each day during September - November 1974. Breakfast program claims indicate that 4,945 paid-for and 9,058 free breakfasts were served each day during December, 1974.

2. According to claims for September-November of this school year, the average cost of producing a lunch is 68¢ versus 55¢ for the same quarter last year. According to breakfast program claims for September-November, breakfast food costs (food purchases plus the costs of obtaining commodities) average 27¢. If labor and indirect costs are also considered the cost of producing a breakfast is approximately 31-35 cents.

3. Student prices have increased by an average of 5¢ per lunch since last school year. The average breakfast price has only increased by 3 cents, but since a number of breakfast programs are in parochial schools which include the breakfast in the tuition fee, this figure is somewhat misleading. For each 5 cent increase in meal cost to paying students there is a loss in participation from 5 to 10%. At least half of the students lost do come back into the program, however.

4. The number of reduced price meals served appears to have increased since the expanded reduced price scale took effect. Reduced price lunches have increased from 5,587 each day during the first three months of last school year to 14,723 each day of September-November of the current school year. Reduced price breakfasts have also increased from 248 daily last year to 719 each day this year.

5. An additional 142 schools or school districts (of a total of 706 participating in the National School Lunch Program) have initiated reduced price lunch programs this school year over last school year.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

6. The most effective legislative change which we would recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program would be the adoption of a universal school lunch program with only a nominal charge, if any.

7. Various factors discourage greater participation in the School Breakfast Program in Minnesota. In the past, inadequate reimbursement rates have been a deterrent, but recent rate increases have made the rates more reasonable compensation for the cost of preparing a reimbursable breakfast. In our own state, widespread bussing of students in rural areas and some metropolitan areas creates a time squeeze. The arrival time of buses and the time classes begin leaves too little time for a breakfast service. Also, there is the additional paperwork involved in maintaining separate breakfast program records and preparing another set of claims for reimbursement. Despite our efforts to promote the program, it is still possible that some schools are unaware of the program's availability. Schools may also refrain from entering the program because of community feelings about breakfast being a family affair.

8. Additional increases in reimbursement rates along with an upgrading of the breakfast nutritional requirements would probably improve participation. If a protein component were required in the breakfast, and reimbursement increased to cover this added cost, the meal would be more likely to sate young appetites and appealing to potential participants.

9. SCHOOL LUNCH

School food service directors across the state have repeatedly stated that school lunch participation would be increased if the students were only served foods which they like and waste would decrease if vegetables and salads were eliminated from the Type A meal pattern. It is not our recommendation that only pizza, hamburger and hot dogs be served or that vegetables and salad be eliminated from the meal pattern, even though it is thought that participation would increase and waste would decrease. However, perhaps the meal pattern could be more flexible by allowing for a range of acceptable portion sizes and by offering choices of foods within each meal component. For example, a student may not eat 1/2 cup of carrots, but would eat 1/4 cup peas and 1/4 cup squash. Although the existing meal pattern allows for a choice of foods, it is not believed that schools generally offer their customers a choice of food items. The purpose of serving a lunch based on the Type A meal pattern is to ensure nutritional adequacy, yet in some instances when only the minimum requirements of the meal pattern are served the meal would not necessarily be nutritionally adequate.

Although the participation rate and the amount of food waste could be a function of the meal pattern, it is thought that meal scheduling, cafeteria atmosphere, meal attractiveness, quality of food served and food preferences are also contributing factors which appear to bear on the rate of participation and the amount of food

50-215 O - 73 -- 6

waste. Above all, the meal pattern should not be modified to limit the variety of foods consumed as it is only through eating a variety of foods that you ensure the consumption of nutrients for which human requirements have not been clearly defined.

BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Although the three component minimum breakfast does not meet 1/3 of the RDA's for children 11-14, if planned correctly it can provide children with a good start toward meeting their nutritional needs. The approval of bread equivalents, FNS Instruction 783-9, has added variation to the bread or cereal component of the meal pattern and as a result the rate of participation should increase due to the added flexibility in this meal component. It is thought that suggested portion sizes be included in the meal pattern to be used as guidelines in feeding children of different ages. Suggested serving sizes for different age groups could help in decreasing food waste.

According to present regulations, protein-rich foods are served only as often as practicable. It is believed that protein-rich foods should be included as part of the breakfast meal pattern twice a week in order to provide an added source of protein, increase the satiety of the meal, increase the variation of foods served and to increase participation as these foods are generally well accepted. The use of fortified formulated breakfast cakes in the breakfast program is not believed to be a nutritionally sound practice, as the cakes usually have a higher refined sugar content and a higher fat content than a breakfast consisting of juice, cereal and milk. Also, the cakes usually lack cellulose which gives bulk to the diet and aids in the digestion process.

10. Discontinuance of the commodity distribution program would require an additional cash reimbursement of at least the 10 cents per meal now guaranteed. In our opinion, commodity distribution should be continued and should return to providing schools with the full gamut of commodities. Many schools have expressed dismay over their difficulties in purchasing the dry staple commodities, shortening and butter which USDA has not been providing this year. Outside the metropolitan area of our state, there is limited access to food brokers and little competitive bidding. With their lack of expertise in quantity buying and problems in obtaining food products appropriate for quantity cooking, these schools are at a disadvantage now that fewer types of foods are being distributed by USDA.

A recent survey of several schools throughout Minnesota reveals the price paid for 100 pounds of all-purpose flour ranged from a low of $13.50 near the metropolitan area to $15.50 and even $19.40 in the isolated northern part of the state. These prices could be compared with the $11.96 - $14.06 range of prices for the same item in the January 2, 1975, Information Release - Summary of purchase for domestic distribution received from the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

11. Non-food assistance needs for new programs are estimated to be $1,700,000 for new programs while existing programs' needs are estimated to be $2,600,000. This fiscal year our state expects to receive $345,197 in non-reserved (existing programs) and $137,374 in reserved (new programs) non-food assistance funds.

12. We estimate that lunch participation would rise from 65% at present to 80% if the National School Lunch Program were made universal with a uniform charge of 10 cents per lunch. The universal lunch is definitely favored by our state agency as well as by schools participating in the program. Assuming that meal costs will increase by 15% to an average of 78 cents per meal minus the 10 cents meal charge to students, annual reimbursement needs could possibly rise to $69,887,367. This would be $47,041,261 more than estimated reimbursement for needs under current program for the 1976 fiscal year. These figures, of course, assume that the present commodity provisions would be continued.

13. If free and reduced price meal eligibility certification were no longer required, there could well be considerable savings by the State Agency and by participating schools. The state agency could save at least a one-half man year in labor costs plus some printing and mailing expenses with total estimated savings of $10,000. Although savings by schools are more difficult to estimate, a limited survey was made asking schools what extra expenses (mailing and printing costs, extra labor in selling and tabulating tickets, labor costs for eligibility determination officials, etc.) are incurred with the present system. Estimates differed greatly with the Minneapolis and St. Paul districts estimating costs of $4.00-$5.00 per child while smaller districts indicated certification-related expenses of $.50 to $2.25 per child enrolled. Using a more conservative estimate of $1.50 per child enrolled in participating schools, savings would be $1,133,553.

14. Indirect meal costs are claimed by 74% of the participants in the National School Lunch Program in our state. Because the claim forms do not ask for a breakdown of the specific expenses included as indirect costs, we can only judge by our experience with individual programs that almost all of that 74% charge for utilities, commodity transportation, administrative overhead, and mealtime supervision labor costs.

15. State reimbursement for school meals is now set at approximately 1 1/2 cents per lunch served in public schools (parochial schools are specifically excepted) and zero reimbursement for breakfasts. Three years ago state reimbursement for meals was approximately 1 cent per lunch. Each year the state legislature appropriates an amount to cover one year's reimbursement. For this school year that appropriation totals $1,419,000.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Matthew, Director
Child Nutrition Section

RT/BK/jh

State of Mississippi

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
G. H. JOHNSTON, SUPERINTENDENT

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE
B. F. Dyal [redacted] DIRECTOR
P. O. Box 771
JACKSON, MISS. 39205

January 28, 1975

Honorable George McGovern, Senator
United States Senate
Select Committee On Nutrition And Human Needs
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

In response to your telegram of recent date relative to School Food Service legislation, we provide you with the following information:

1. Paid lunches served daily - 151,889
   Free lunches served daily - 263,335
   Paid breakfasts served daily - 3,501
   Free breakfasts served daily - 20,334

2. Average cost of producing a lunch - .6551
   Average cost of producing a breakfast - .1800 (basic breakfast)
   Cost of lunch compared to last year - Up about 10¢
   Cost of breakfast compared to last year - Up about .03

3. Student lunch price increase - Approximately .05 cents
   Student breakfast price increase - None
   No appreciable loss of paying students.

4. Number reduced priced lunches served daily - 4,473
   Number reduced priced breakfasts served daily - 426

5. Effect of reduced priced program-
   Nov. 1973 figures showed 31,486 reduced lunches.
   Nov. 1974 figures show 290,744 reduced lunches.
   (The above figures are cumulative, Sept. through Nov.)
   Number of districts utilizing reduced price meals - 61 districts out of total of 150.

6. Legislative changes to prevent loss of paying students. Remove the stigma of the free lunch by charging all students a small fee.

7. Why has breakfast program not expanded?

   (1) Administrative problems; (2) time element, that is, finding time at beginning of day; (3) record keeping requirements relative to free meals, free milk and the attempt to protect identity of free or reduced participants; (4) attitude that breakfast should be a family obligation; (5) lack of public information.

8. Legislation that would improve breakfast participation and quality of breakfast.

   (1) Remove requirement of two fluids, milk and juice.
   (2) Standardize cost or charge a minimal amount for all breakfast (.05 as an example).

9. Modifications in meal pattern of lunch program.

   No need to change meal pattern, however, elimination of free milk would aid nutrition in that food would be eaten. There would be less plate waste. Special Milk Program elimination would aid nutrition, reduce waste and save the nation more than 100 million dollars per year. Special Milk Program simply not needed.

10. (a) If commodity program were to end, how much cash per meal would be needed to offset it?

    Approximately 10¢ per meal.
    Continue commodity program.
    Continue to provide protein items and when possible, revert back to distribution of flour.

    (b) No, it is not possible for many schools to make purchases comparable to U.S.D.A. Some larger districts may accomplish this but many small rural schools could not.

    Our schools could not purchase quality ground beef as purchased by U.S.D.A. It appears that beef purchased by U.S.D.A. is about 25¢ cheaper per pound.

11. Equipment needs - We have very little need for equipment for new programs since we serve all public schools and all but a very few eligible private schools.

Equipment needs for existing programs - There is a continuous need in this area. We could effectively use about $250,000 per year over an extended period.

Funds expected this year: $250,000 unreserved and $150,000 reserved. (We cannot possibly use more than $40 - 50,000 of reserved funds.)

12. Percentage participation if School Lunch Program were to be made universal? Small increase, because we already serve 84% in average daily attendance.

We would look with great favor on a 10c program because we feel that a high percentage of students could and would afford 10¢. The problem of small percent that could not pay 10¢ could be eliminated by accepting food stamps in lieu of cash.

At 10¢ per meal, collected from each meal served, we would collect approximately $7,200,000 per year. This is about 60-70% of the amount collected presently.

13. How much money could be saved by instituting a universal program? No way to provide a feasible estimate, however, considerable time, and effort would be saved. A much more favorable public image would be accomplished and better cooperation on the part of school administrators.

14. Percent of school districts charging the lunch program for cost of:

Utilities	-	Approximately 10%
Transportation of U.S.D.A. foods	-	95%
Administrative overhead	-	None for administration, 30% for supervision
Employment of personnel for supervision	-	5%

15. Current levels of state reimbursement -

For lunches	-	.0075 cents per lunch
For breakfast	-	None
Increase in three years	-	About .0025 cents per lunch
Total State money for current year	-	$664,110

Sincerely,

J. H. Walker
Assistant Director
Administration and Finance

JHW:ah

ARTHUR L. MALLORY
Commissioner

Area Code 314
751-3526

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Public Schools
Jefferson Building
P. O. Box 480
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65101

February 11, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
U. S. Senate Select Committee
on Nutrition and Human Needs
Room 301, Senate Annex
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This is in response to your recent telegram in which you have requested specific information on 15 items dealing with the operation of Child Nutrition Programs in our State.

We shall try to respond to these 15 questions in the order in which they were stated in the telegram.

(1) Out of an average daily attendance of 964,589, an average of 406,411 students paid for their lunches and an additional 163,092 lunches were served daily to needy students during November.

Under the breakfast program, an average of 1,040 students paid for their breakfasts and an additional 22,239 were served free daily.

(2) It is estimated that the average cost for producing a Type A lunch in our State this year will be 72 cents. On the basis of November reports, the average cost of producing a school breakfast was 44 1/2 cents.

(3) It has been our observation that the charge for student lunches has increased on an average of 8 to 10 cents over last year. It is our best judgment that this increase in price has had a direct bearing on a decrease in the number of students buying their lunches. A part of this decrease can be attributed to the inflation squeeze on parent budgets; however, there is a possibility that some of the students we have lost as paying students are now receiving reduced price lunches or, in some instances, free lunches under the income guidelines.

Most of the children being served in the breakfast program are located in low income areas and are receiving the breakfasts free. We have not noted an increase in the charge for breakfasts, which remains at 10 cents, and is the same as last year.

(4) On the basis of our latest information, 9,933 reduced price lunches are being served daily and an average of 147 reduced price breakfasts are being served. For the same month a year ago, an average of 608 reduced price lunches were served and no breakfasts were served in the reduced price classification.

(5) As a result of the expanded reduced price program this year, participation has increased from 1,639 in the highest month to the present 9,933.

Out of a total of 808 districts participating in our programs, 721 have adopted both the free and reduced price offerings, with only 87 exercising their option to extend free lunches only.

(6) I would be hesitant in recommending what legislative changes should be made to stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program. On the basis of my conversations with many school administrators, parents who have been paying for their children's lunches over the years are reluctant to make application for reduced price lunches, which they look upon as charity. We doubt that any legislative changes will result in a change in parent attitude toward social welfare programs. More and more it is apparent that the American people are looking upon the National School Lunch Program as one that is intended primarily for welfare children. We do not feel that parent attitudes toward accepting charity as a way of life can be changed by Federal legislation.

(7) It is our opinion that lack of interest in initiating breakfast programs has several explanations. First, schools have experienced financial difficulty in the operation of their lunch program and are hesitant in incurring additional expense for another food service. A breakfast program requires rescheduling of classes, earlier bus routings, rescheduling personnel, and to date, a lack of interest in participation in those schools where the program is in operation. In some instances, school administrators and food service personnel are overloaded with other programs and there is a prevailing attitude in our State that the serving of breakfasts is a family responsibility. I certainly would not attribute the slow rate of expansion to a lack of public information. In addition to news releases and information distributed by community action committees, all schools in Missouri have been supplied with information on the aid available for the initiation of a breakfast program.

(8) In my opinion, there is little that can be done with the legislation to improve the participation rate in the breakfast program.

(9) We do not feel that there is need for modification in the Type A meal pattern for the National School Lunch Program. We have over the years encouraged schools, particularly at the high school level, to involve students in menu planning and to offer a choice of Type A lunches. We feel that the pattern is sound and sufficiently flexible to offer menus the children will accept and, with a little encouragement through nutrition education in the classroom, schools could cut food waste to a minimum. Students need to be reminded of the lifetime benefits of nutritionally adequate lunches and the true purposes for which the National School Lunch Program was established. This should be a part of the educational process.

In those schools where a breakfast program is in operation and since reimbursement rates are more flexible, we would recommend an improvement in the present minimum breakfast requirements.

(10) (A) In the event the commodity program is discontinued and replaced with cash on a per meal basis, we would propose that the present level of 10 cents be continued and be increased each year in line with the consumer food index. Commodity aid through the School Lunch Program has been traditional since its inception in 1946. The base upon which commodity aid was established must be maintained. It is my sincere belief that the schools of this nation would receive more for their dollar through a *cash out* for a number of reasons. Millions of commodity dollars are being expended for administration at the Federal, regional, and local levels. Warehousing, transportation, cold storage costs, and handling at the Federal, State, and local levels continue to escalate. Schools would then be in a position to purchase more in line with their capacity to store and utilize more efficiently. Federal purchase and shipping schedules are much too erratic, and over the years and still today are related to the need for surplus removal operations. Budgets at the local level must be established prior to the opening of a school year. If schools could rely on a *cash out* on commodities, better planning and purchasing can be done.

(B) It is our opinion that most schools could purchase from local wholesalers and distributors, the various food items required, just as economically from the standpoint of the taxpayer's dollar that goes into actual food when we give consideration to the amount of Federal dollars that are expended for administration, storage, repackaging, handling, and transportation in getting these foods into the various States.

(11) It is our best judgment that <u>if</u> we could encourage all of the no-program schools in our State to accept participation in the School Lunch Program we would need approximately $100,000 in reserved equipment funds. For our existing programs, it is conservatively estimated that we could use $500,000 during this school year. Our Federal allocation of nonfood assistance funds this year totals $431,324, of which $84,809 is reserved for no-program schools and $346,515 for existing programs.

(12) On the basis of our many discussions with school administrators, it is our best judgment that even with a universal program we could only expect a maximum potential participation of approximately 85 percent. It is our feeling that if a 10-cent charge for lunch was assessed all students our potential participation would probably decline to 75 percent as we may be eliminating some of the most needy of the needy. I would not personally favor such a program.

Based on our average daily attendance for the last full month upon which we have data, we had an average daily attendance of 964,589. If we reach an average of 85 percent, or 819,901 children, over a period of 174 school days, we would be serving 142,662,774 lunches. Our calculations tell us that if we served 142,662,774 lunches at the present cost of 72 cents a universal program would require an expenditure of $102,717,197 in Missouri alone. This is $74,444,567 more than the $28,272,630 we anticipate we will receive this year under Sections 4 and 11. The savings would be minimal should a 10-cent charge be assessed all students.

Strictly on the basis of tax dollars required for a universal program at both the Federal and State levels, and until nutrition education becomes a reality in our classrooms, I personally would not favor a universal free lunch program.

(13) It would be difficult at this point to identify with any degree of accuracy how much time and money our State would save under a universal program. Certainly, accountability would be required much the same as under the present program. We do not anticipate that there would be much of a reduction in Federal and State administrative cost; however, we do feel that much of the paper work and reporting could be eliminated drastically.

(14) Over the past 29 years, we as well as other States throughout the nation had encouraged local school districts to assume such costs as utilities, custodial service, and school administrative overhead as a normal cost of operation. Generally, such costs were not charged against the School Lunch Program. As reimbursement rates under Section 11 have been increased at the Federal level and categorical State matching has been mandated by Federal regulations, it has been necessary under cost accounting to require schools to go back and pull out all of these costs (both direct and indirect) in order to justify the reimbursement extended for the free lunch child. Each year since such justification has been required (both direct and indirect), more and more schools have shown a tendency to shift from indirect to direct costing since these costs have now been identified. There appears to be a tendency and attitude toward making the School Lunch Program pay its own way and to reserve limited tax monies available to the local districts strictly for instructional programs. As inflation continues to escalate and State matching of the Section 4 grant has been mandated by the Federal Government, it has been noted that more and more teachers, through their associations and unions, are demanding a *duty free* lunch period. This has resulted in a transfer of supervision during the lunch period to *teacher aides* and an indirect cost against the lunch program for this service. In some instances, we have observed that this service is being reported as a direct cost. Under our reporting system, we require all schools

to report transportation and commercial cold storage costs of USDA foods as a part of their food expenditures. This item is becoming more and more significant as transportation · tes and the cost of commercial storage within the States continue to escalate.

(15) It is anticipated that the current level of State reimbursement for lunches served this year will approximate .0172 for each reimbursable lunch to be served. All State reimbursement funds are applied to the School Lunch Program. The average rate of State reimbursement funds per lunch for fiscal 1972 amounted to .0069; fiscal 1973, .0069; and fiscal year 1974, an average of .0145.

The State categorical matching for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 amounted to $625,000 each year. Under the formula for required State matching, the appropriation for fiscal year 1974 amounted to $1,320,652. It is anticipated that in fiscal 1975 $1,689,477 will be required to meet the mandated State matching. This amount has been appropriated at the State level and is available for distribution to our schools.

We are hopeful that the foregoing information will be of assistance to your committee in your deliberations toward meeting the Federal level needs for implementing the Food and Nutrition Service Programs in fiscal year 1976.

Sincerely,

Earl M. Langkop

Earl M. Langkop, Director
School Food Services

STATE OF MONTANA
OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT
HELENA, MONTANA

DOLORES COLBURG
Superintendent of
Public Instruction

February 3, 1975

Honorable George McGovern
U. S. Senate Select Committee
on Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Sir:

Attached is our response to your telegram of January 23, 1975 requesting information on Child Nutrition Programs in Montana.

This information pertains only to public schools as private school food programs are administered by the Food and Nutrition Service Office in Dallas.

Basic program information is for the month of December 1975 and comparisons are with December of 1974.

If you have any questions or if we may be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

H. BRISBIN SKILES
Supervisor
School Food Services

HBS:sej

Enclosure

February 3, 1975

Child Nutrition Programs in Montana

1. Schools with Lunch Programs

	1974-75	1973-74
Number of Schools	556	520
ADA	135,788	128,079
Average Daily Participation	79,199	69,630
Daily Paid Meals	59,590	53,916
Daily Free	17,779	13,271
Daily Reduced	1,770	443
Percent ADP of ADA	58%	54%
Percent Paid of ADA	44%	42%
Percent Free & Reduced of ADA	14%	12%

You will note there has been a two percent increase in the percent of paid meals served in relation to ADA and a two percent increase in free and reduced priced meals served in relation to ADA.

Schools with Breakfast Programs

	1974-75	1973-74
Number of Schools	40	30
ADA	10,618	5,452
ADP	3,242	2,065
Breakfasts served Free	1,998	1,677
Reduced Price	59	0
Percent Free and Reduced of ADA	19%	31%

The growth of the breakfast program in Montana is severely inhibited by attitudinal factors related to family function and consequent lack of support by local school boards and administrators.

2. The estimate of average cost per lunch served this year, not including commodities, is 75 cents. The 1973-74 average was approximately 65 cents. The breakfast average is about 50 cents compared to the 1973-74 average of approximately 40 cents.

3. The charge to the child for lunch and breakfasts has increased on the average approximately five cents per meal. When compared to the other price increases, this makes school food programs a better buy than before. This factor and our efforts to make the programs more attractive may account for our increasing rate of participation.

4. See number one above.

5. Very few schools offered the reduced price meals prior to this year. Approximately 65 of the 219 school districts with lunch programs offer reduced price meals. The number of eligible families submitting applications has been very low. This may be because it has not been offered to the majority of eligible families prior to this year and eligible families are reluctant to submit applications.

6. Increased federal reimbursement to allow schools to reduce the charge to the child and maintain or improve the program without increasing the local district burden.

7. See number one above.

8. Change the name from breakfast to snack program. This would help remove attitudinal objections relative to the family function. Also, provide for serving in either the AM, PM or both during the school day, i.e. morning snack, afternoon snack. I do not feel this will detract from the lunch program but will instead bring children into the cafeteria.

9. None. Every effort should be made to improve local programs and reduce the institutional feeding aspects. This would include more care in the preparation and serving of food, greater emphasis on educational and nutritional aspects and less on feeding hungry needy children. Many eligible families feel that school food programs are charity and will not participate. Many children from wealthier families are also nutritionally deprived.

10. A(1) A minimum of 15 cents per meal.

(2) Undecided. Foods purchased this year have been very acceptable. Problems in getting food to local schools sometimes out weigh the advantages.

B. Some foods may be obtained fairly consistently at the same price by local districts. At certain times, other foods may be purchased locally at reasonable costs.

11. The estimated need for nonfood assistance funds this year is approximately $174,000. The allocation is $95,000. For existing programs, the need is $95,000 with $42,000 available.

12. (a) I would anticipate an increase in participation from 58% to 65% of ADA.

(b) I would favor such a program. The estimated funds needed at a child charge of 10 cents per meal is as follows:

Anticipated ADP		No. School Days		Reimbursement	Total
132,000	X	180	X	60c per meal	= $14,256,000

13. It is impossible to estimate the time and money to be saved in Montana if requirements regarding certification of need were eliminated. Needless to say, it would be considerable. This would be true only if they were not replaced with other kinds of requirements.

14. Percent of school districts charging the following to the lunch program:

(a)	Utilities	25%
(b)	Cost of acquiring USDA foods	100%
(c)	School Administrative overhead	0%
(d)	Employment	40%

15. The state reimbursement to school food programs is made as a one time cash payment each year. The total each school district receives is based on the percent of federal reimbursement it has received for the year. The amount of state funds appropriated is sufficient to meet federal requirements and for fiscal year 1975 is $228,880.

NEWELL J. PAIGE
COMMISSIONER
ROBERT L. BRUNELLE
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION
STATE HOUSE ANNEX
CONCORD, 03301

February 10, 1975

Senator George McGovern, Chairman
U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs
Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

In response to your telegram of January 23rd the following data apply to the State of New Hampshire:

1) How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in New Hampshire each day? Breakfasts?

	Lunches - Average Daily	
	1974	1973
Public Schools		
Free	16,201	--
Paid	67,637	--
Private Schools		
Free	651	--
Paid	2,674	--

	Breakfasts - Average Daily	
	1974	1973
Public Schools		
Free	550	--
Paid	1,251	--

Private Schools		
Free	39	--
Paid	20	--

2) Average cost estimates in New Hampshire for producing a lunch for fiscal 1975. Breakfast.

	Lunch - Average Cost Per Plate	
	1974	1973
Public Schools	.6718	.6472
Private Schools	1.0150	.6863
	Breakfast - Average Cost Per Plate	
	1974	1973
Public Schools	.4250	.3200
Private Schools	.8943	.7000

3) Student lunch prices have not increased on the average over last year. Due to increases in Section IV reimbursement and corresponding increases in State reimbursement as a result of the matching formula, we were able to stand off, at least until mid-January, a nickel per plate increase. Even with this holding action on school lunch prices, there was a considerable loss of paid lunch participation during the early part of the fall, in fact our figures indicate there was a loss of approximately 11,000 meals per day among paying students. We have recouped our losses however, in terms of participation, so that by January our figures were again relatively comparable in terms of average daily participation with previous year. To pursue the issue, this agency has done special advertising pointing out the 30% housing cost clause which would make many middle income families eligible for participation at reduced price.

4) Reduced Price Lunches	1974	1973
Public Schools	3,110	1,363
Private Schools	229 335	365 72
Reduced Price Breakfasts	1974	1973
Public Schools	28	3
Private Schools	97 125	271 274

5) The effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation is still difficult to measure. Many school districts were not aware, although they had been informed, of the difference in revenue with respect to reduced price rates. However, even last year with the expanded scale for reduced price lunches, we were not successful in adding large numbers of children in this category to program participation.

6) It would seem to this agency that with the northern New Hampshire ethic of wanting to pay for something rather than accepting anything that's materially a welfare program, that substantially larger numbers of students would participate in the National School Lunch and Breakfast Program if there were a universal reduced priced lunch at say 25 or even 30 cents per lunch.

7) The School Breakfast Program is not particularly popular with school administration. I think the major problem in development of program participation is related to the large numbers of students being bused and, the difficulty of getting students all on school grounds in time to participate in a reasonable breakfast program. For this reason administration has balked at even instituting such programs. Then too, a great deal of the public does not agree with the whole concept of even eating breakfast. American dietary patterns have changed over the past few years and many, many people do not have more than a glass of milk or cup of coffee for breakfast, nationwide. From the nutritionist's point of view this is deplorable; it is a fact of life in American society. It is our feeling that this is the major reason for lack of public demand and program implementation. Where we do have breakfast programs operating however, and once the population is accustomed to having their children participate, we have noted that there has been considerable participation.

8) We have been experimenting with a mid-morning nutritious snack program in lieu of breakfast programs, but totally subsidized by children's payments. In pursuing this kind of program we have been emphasizing fruit along with the mid-morning or recess milk received under the Special Milk Program. In my opinion, legislation which would allow us more flexibility with respect to both breakfast pattern and time of day at which the breakfast program ought be to offered would substantially help the program. Many younger children upon arising, faced with a long bus trip, do not eat because otherwise they would be car sick in the school bus. As a result they arrive at the school without breakfast and perhaps with a little queazy stomach from the long bus ride. We have in those schools where student groups offer various "snack" items at the mid-morning recess found that there is a large participation. If we are interested in providing alternatives for children and in particular offering these materials to the less fortunate child perhaps these kinds of programatic changes would be helpful. With respect to modifications in the meal pattern, we are forced by the U.S.D.A. regulation to insist on the delivery of the entire amount in the Type A pattern. We have experience, from observing serving lines that students have catergorically announced to the server that they did not care for a portion of a certain product. The product was delivered and promptly thrown out. It would seem to

50-219 O - 75 - 7

us the Type A program is a major contributer to food wastage in the Nation at this point in time. If modifications were to be made in the meal pattern I think that it would be reasonable to request that these modifications identify with current life styles in American society. Lunch for most Americans consist of a sandwich, a beverage and either fruit or some sort of baked product. It would seem that there might be an alternative level of Type A funding that would allow us to have a mini Type A program if you will.

10A) The attitude of this agency is to see the end of the commodity program and to receive dollars in lieu of commodities. The 10 cent rate seems to us to be reasonable, however with the receipt of cash this agency would enter into a cooperative buying program with the various school agencies in order to purchase those commodities which are commensurate with the dietary habits of this part of the country. This is not to criticize the purchases of the U.S.D.A. in terms of types of commodities for fiscal 1975. However, it continues to irk us that the Department of Agriculture should be competing in the open market place for my consumer dollar and thereby forcing the retail price of food stuffs up to me as a private citizen. This has serious implementations for food stamp recipients. Perhaps this whole area should be looked into.

10B) In our opinion it is possible for the schools to purchase in a cooperative scheme and to buy from local wholesalers as reasonably and as cheaply as the United States Department of Agriculture is able to do for us.

11) Our equipment needs are of course slowing down as we put more schools onto the program. Under our Master Plan of implementation of the National School Lunch Program we have programed the receipt of approximately $120,000 to $130,000 of nonfood assistance each year. This year our receipt was approximately $128,000.

12) Percentage increase in participation of course would probably double under such a program. We feel that a 10 cent figure is somewhat low however. We agree that at a 10 cent rate the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. In fact our agency would see no need whatsoever for the 10 cent lunch being provided free. In the area of school administration we figure that approximately $958,000 would be saved annually in this State in administrative time, paper shuffling, and paper, not to mention governmental overseeing expenses for the administration of the very complex regulations utilized currently to determine free and reduced price meal recipients. To operate the program at the 10 cent per meal level we would estimate a probable 72% participation or approximately 137,024 children per day. At this rate the operating expense for the entire system would be $16,554,818. Anticipated revenue from students at the 10 cent rate would be $2,466,432 leaving us with an operating expense of $14,088,386. Current federal grants for school lunch including nonfood assistance and state administrative expense total $2,814,016 leaving a net amount to be funded of $11,274,370.

13) Projecting the cost for universal free program we anticipate approximately 86% of our student population would participate. This equates to an operating expense of $19,741,334 per annum. In our view the amount of state administrative expense would probably not be significantly reduced since undoubtly federal regulation, if this program was entirely federally funded, would become more complex in terms of the state responsibility for supervision of local program operations. As mentioned above there would be $958,000 saving statewide in terms of administrative expense for the business of free and reduced price meal recipient certification. The question is one of attitude. Certainly a reduction of complexity of the administrative difficulty would make the program much more acceptable to school administration. In our view the key to operations of this sort is positive administrative attitude. In terms of benefits to children, we would suggest that the universal or the 10 cent scheme might well result in considerably greater numbers of students participating than currently do. A note of comment on our figure of 86% participation in a universal program. It is our opinion that no matter how the program is presented there will be a certain number of students on a daily basis who will either be absent or who will not participate for various personal attitudual reasons.

14A) All school districts have been instructed to charge their lunch program for the cost of utilities. Many districts however are having great difficulties in defining the appropriate dollar amounts for utilities since it is infrequent that these are metered separately from the remainder of the school. For this reason we have asked school districts to use similar methods for the allocation of U.S.D.A foods as are found in HEW's Handbook #2, revised.

14B) Transportation of U.S.D.A. foods are charged at a percentage of their wholesale value by the New Hampshire State Distributing Agency. We do permit the school districts to charge the transportation cost of U.S.D.A. foods as a legitimate cost of food expense. School administrative overhead is not allowable as an expense item due to restriction by a FNS instruction letter.

14D) Most school districts would like to charge for the employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period. At this point in time however, a federal audit team is in our State and they have disallowed the cost of employment of personnel supervision during the lunch period as a result of FNS instruction #796-3. Their theory is that school districts are required to support the supervision of children during that period of time during which the children are in school and therefore this is not a legitimate charge on the part of the school district for the school lunch program. This agency is inclined to agree with that philosophy. State reimbursement has been defined by the legislature as the minimum amount as required under regulations surrounding public Law 91-248. No state reimbursement level has been determined for breakfast. Due to the escalator clause included in public Law 91-248 the percentage of

state matching money has increased annually. The total appropriation for fiscal 1975 for state matching money is $246,000.

Sincerely yours,

George A. Bussell

George A. Bussell
Director, Food & Nutrition Service

GAB:df

State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
225 WEST STATE STREET
P.O. BOX 2019
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

DIVISION OF FIELD SERVICES
Bureau of Food Program Administration

February 10, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
Chairman, United States Senate Select
Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

This is in reply to your request for information regarding the Child Nutrition Programs in New Jersey.

1. Average Daily Participation (Public and Private)

A. National School Lunch Program

	Fiscal 75	Fiscal 76
Paid	245,946	294,613
Reduced	6,626	9,661
Free	167,380	209,856

B. School Breakfast Program

Paid	10,335	12,946
Reduced	1,649	1,325
Free	24,417	28,227

2. Average Cost of Producing (Providing) a Meal in School

	Fiscal 74	Fiscal 75
Lunch	$ .80	$ .90
Breakfast	$ .40	$ .45

3. The increase in student price over last year is as follows:

Lunch	$ .05
Breakfast	$ .05

New Jersey sets maximum prices for both lunches and breakfasts served to children. This practice controls increases and prevents adverse effects on participation. I would recommend this procedure in all states.

4. There will be a significant increase in the number of reduced-price lunches served in New Jersey in Fiscal Year 1976 since a State law will mandate that schools offer both free and reduced-price lunches in schools that have five percent of enrollment eligible for such lunches.

5. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the Lunch Program because of all of the reasons outlined in your telegram. New Jersey school administrators are especially reluctant to initiate Breakfast Programs since State law requires most schools to initiate Lunch Programs starting in September, 1975. Many School Boards do not feel that they should offer both programs.

6. Permanent legislation in the Breakfast Program would help expand the Program. Recent budget cuts as proposed by the administration make program expansion difficult even if the budget is restored. A permanent program with adequate funds would tend to produce quality and in my opinion quality dictates participation.

7. Suggested Meal Pattern Changes

   A. Remove the butter requirements in the Lunch Program. Also change the fruit and/or vegetable requirement that stipulates two sources of such fruit and/or vegetables.

8. If the commodity program would end, we would need $.10 per meal. This reimbursement should be tied to an escalator clause. I do want the commodity program to continue but suggest the flexibility that would provide cash to school districts serving a high percentage of prepackaged meals.

9. In my opinion, it is generally not possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers as cheaply as the United States Department of Agriculture is able to purchase.

   This is especially true in small school districts. New Jersey has 605 school districts many of which are small.

10. Our equipment needs in terms of dollars is as follows:

	FISCAL 75	FISCAL 76
Reserved	$ 1,586,555	$ 3,000,000
Unreserved	$ 288,653	$ 1,000,000

    I suggest greater flexibility in allocating Non-Food Assistance funds to school districts. The reserved aspects of the program are too restrictive.

11. A universal reduced-price program could possibly increase participation by 75%. I would favor such a program

12. The time and money (administrative) saved by a universal program would be great. This savings would be primarily at the school district level where a great amount of time and money is spent on certification paperwork. I cannot, at this time, estimate funds that could be saved.

13. Percent of districts that charge for the following costs:

    A. Utilities 2%
    B. Transportation of U.S.D.A. Foods 50%
    C. School Administrative Overhead (including Director) 40%
    D. Lunch Period Supervision 25%

14. State Reimbursement

All Lunches	$ .06
Reduced Price Lunches	$ .07 average
Free Lunches	$ .07 average

    Our State Expenditures for the Lunch Program have been as follows:

Fiscal Year 1973	$ 4,465,933
Fiscal Year 1974	$ 7,319,418
Fiscal Year 1975 (Budgeted)	$ 8,500,000

Much of the information provided in this report is estimated. If additional information is required, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Walter F. Colender, Director
Food Program Administration

WFC:pg

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION — EDUCATION BUILDING

SANTA FE — 87501

February 7, 1975

Senator George McGovern, Chairman
U. S. Senate Select Committee on
Nutrition and Human Needs
Washington, D. C. 20510

Attention: Mr. Alan Stone

Dear Alan:

In answer to your wire of January 23rd, I wish to make the following responses:

1. Average number of lunches served during the month of November 1974 ----202,634
   Average number of breakfasts served during the month of November 1974---- 14,444

2. Average cost of producing a lunch this year ---------- 63¢ to 65¢
   Average cost of producing a breakfast this year ---------- 29¢ to 31¢

   Food and labor cost have both increased approximately 12% over last year's operation costs.

3. Statistics for the month of October show an increase in participation of 5% over October 1973. However, there was a drop of 6% in paid lunches for the same period. An increase of 3% is shown in reduced price lunches between October 1973 and 1974, and an increase of 6% in free lunches for the same period. A total of fifteen (15) school districts increased their price from 45¢ to 50¢ during the current school year. This increase in prices resulted in a drop in participation ranging from 3% to 17%. Breakfast prices have not been increased. The average increase in the lunch price was 5¢. There is a definite correlation in the loss of participation among paying students as the increases have occurred.

4. There has been an increase of 150% in the service of reduced price lunches. Breakfasts have increased also due to the increase in the number of participating schools. This increase, however, has not been so dramatic because of the low cost of breakfast and the fact that practically all breakfasts are served at no cost at all to the child. Approximately 510 children are served a reduced price breakfast each day.

5. The expanded reduced price program has brought practically every school district in the state back into the reduced price lunch program this year. There are only three or four districts in the entire state that do not participate in a reduced price program.

6. I do not believe substantive changes in legislation would be required to reverse the trend of paying-students leaving the lunch program. I rather believe that a flexibility within the Type A pattern allowing for lighter meals offered during breaks in school schedules, such as mid-morning and mid-afternoon, would bring many students into the Child Nutrition Programs. Implementation of present regulations allowing for selectivity in the Type A pattern in general improvement of management and merchandising could also offset this trend. The major problem continues to be the increasing charge to the paying child due to increasing costs.

7. The main reason the school breakfast program has not expanded in New Mexico more rapidly than it has is because of the additional administrative responsibility which school principals are reluctant to undertake. Some lack of public information may be responsible. The attitude "This is the Family Job" is certainly prevalent in some areas of the state.

8 & 9. Changes in legislation allowing children to participate in the breakfast program at selected times during the school day would allow for greater participation rate. This would accommodate half day sessions and those children who need some type of nutritional supplement before they go home at the end of the day, in areas where low income is very pronounced and where other nutritious foods are not available.

10. (A) If the commodity program were to end New Mexico schools would need at least 13¢ to 15¢ to offset the loss. I do not wish to see the commodity program discontinued; however, improvements in purchasing programs and general distribution could be brought about with closer coordination between commodity distribution centers and school food service managers.

(B) It is not possible for small semi-rural and rural districts to purchase from local wholesalers in the quantities and at the prices which USDA is able to buy. For instance, school districts in New Mexico are now paying 16¢ a pound for flour as compared to 11¢ paid by USDA last year. Most school districts are paying 90¢ to 93¢ for equal quality ground beef.

11. At the present time New Mexico equipment needs exceed available funds by at least $100,000. All of our programs are existing programs where the need is most urgent for replacement of worn out and obsolete equipment. We will receive this year approximately $101,000.

12. If the School Lunch Program were to be made universal at 10¢ per lunch for all students, I would anticipate an increase in participation of approximately 20% to 25%. I would favor a program which would charge

a minimal amount for all lunches, thereby removing the stigman of poverty from some children but enabling all children to have a lunch at a cost that would not be prohibitive. At the present time I cannot estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program. Certainly a reimbursement level commensurate with a 10¢ charge would need to be established.

13. We have estimated that New Mexico spends approximately 4¢ on each lunch for the paper work and certification procedure involved. On the basis of 30 million meals a year this would result in a saving of $1.2 million.

14. There are no school districts in our state that charge for utilities, transportation of USDA donated commodities, school administrative overhead, or employment of personnel for supervision.

15. At the present time there are no direct state appropriation for reimbursement to the lunch program. However, the New Mexico legislature is considering a Bill which would provide for direct subsidy of 5¢ for every lunch served, or a total appropriation not to exceed $1.5 million.

Thank you very much for your support and interest in these programs. Please advise us if there is any way we can be of further assistance to you.

Very sincerely yours,

Gretchen

(Mrs.) Gretchen Y. Flagge, Director
School Food Service Division

P.S. Nixon
The President's Budget message
is really a disaster! I know you will
be putting every effort behind preparing
our present programs! Let me know what
we can do!

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
99 WASHINGTON AVENUE
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE
BUREAU OF SCHOOL FOOD MANAGEMENT

February 7, 1975

Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
United States Senate Select Committee
on Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20540

Dear Senator McGovern:

In reply to your telegram of January 23rd, we have prepared the following information for your Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. We hope that our responses to the questions will assist you in securing improvements for the school nutrition programs during the current year.

1. The average daily participation rate in New York State for paid lunches is 675,000; for free lunches is 740,000. For Breakfast Program, the average daily participation for paid breakfasts is 6,560; for free breakfasts is 85,750.

2. It is estimated that the average cost of producing a lunch during the 1974-75 school year will be $.83 as compared with a $.75 per lunch cost last year.

Estimates of the cost of producing a breakfast during the 1974-75 school year are $.44 per breakfast as compared with a $.40 per breakfast cost last year.

3. The students' price per lunch has increased an average of $.10 during the current year. Some loss of participation has occurred in programs where the increase was greater than $.10. In addition, there has been an increased participation in the free and reduced price program from students who formerly paid for their lunch, but who are now eligible for the free and reduced price program because of the poor economic situation in the country.

The following statistics are indicative of the changes in participation in the program during comparable periods:

	1973-74 School Year ADP	1974-75 School Year ADP
Free	704,000	740,000
Reduced	15,000	40,900
Paid	770,000	675,000

The student's price per breakfast has increased $.05 during the 1974-75 school year. Because few students in the breakfast program pay for the breakfast, it is difficult to determine whether the increased cost has effected participation.

4. The average daily participation in the reduced price program during the 1974-75 school year is 40,900; last years daily participation in this program was 15,000.

The average daily participation in the reduced breakfast program during the 1974-75 school year is 6,590; during the 1973-74 school year it was 5,500.

5. State participation in the reduced price lunch program has increased by approximately 50%. There are 97 new sponsors in the program this year.

6. The single most important legislative change which would help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program would be a substantial increase in the financial assistance for the paid lunch. If reimbursement could be increased by $.15 to $.20 and more innovative meal patterns introduced as discussed in our reply to question 9, the decline in paying students could be stopped.

7. The Breakfast Program has expanded more slowly than the lunch program primarily because of the resistence to the program by school administrators. Many do take the attitude that "breakfast is the family job." Others believe that the breakfast program brings the same congregate problems associated with the lunch program and are unwilling to add to the many problems which are already part of operating a school. There are also difficulties of an administrative nature connected with the breakfast program such as an earlier opening of school, need for supervision in the cafeteria and a longer day for the food service staff, all of which contribute to a reluctance to participate in the program.

8. We do not believe that legislative changes are needed in the breakfast program at this time.

9. There should be more diversity permitted in the types of meals which would be eligible for reimbursement. Meal patterns should be more compatible with social mores of todays school population. Paying students are attracted to the a-la-carte items because they are the items that students are eating in todays times.

The current pattern of the Type A lunch contributes to food waste and discourages paying students from participating in the program. Students who take the Type A lunch because they are in the free or reduced price program, throw away the items they are required to take but which they do not like.

Consideration should be given to allowing adjustments to the Type A pattern by permitting students to reject unwanted items and adjusting the reimbursement rate accordingly. Nutritionally equivalent a-la-carte items should be reimbursed to permit students to choose from a greater variety of food items and not be forced to take a food item which he knows in advance will be discarded.

Meal patterns for the breakfast program do not require modification at this time.

10A. If the commodity distribution program should end, it would require a cash payment of $.12 per meal to offset the loss.

Because the commodity program provides only 20% or less of the food purchases of a participating local agency, the program has lost most of its value. However, the U.S. Department of Agriculture can eliminate the current commodity program while still continuing to provide market assistance by establishing a voucher system. The voucher system would provide a procedure through which the State agency could direct to the participating schools and institutions, a voucher permitting them to buy a specific commodity which the U.S.D.A. wishes to purchase on the open market. The school district or institution could purchase locally the specified commodity or return the voucher. A State procedure for purchasing in quantity could be established to insure favorable prices for the commodities purchased.

10B. The large suburban and urban districts would probably be able to purchase fruits and vegetables and most meats as cheaply as the U.S.D.A., however it is not possible for the smaller school districts, mostly rural central schools, to approach the purchasing value of the U.S.D.A. An example is the current offer to the U.S.D.A. of Frozen Ground Beef at 54¢ per pound. The best price offered to three rural districts contacted was 76¢ with a high of 88¢ per pound, whereas a large suburban district is purchasing quality ground beef for 59¢ per pound.

11. The current appropriation for equipment for new programs is approximately $1,360,000. Of this amount New York State will spend approximately 50%.

The current appropriation for existing programs is $906,000; there are requests pending for $1.5 million, resulting in a shortage of approximately 50% in the area.

There are certain basic problems connected with this program. Failure on the part of Congress to provide continuous and stable funding of these programs and to approve annual budgets in a timely fashion creates considerable difficulty in convincing schools to participate in the program when the funding is so indefinite. In addition, there are no funds available for alterations or other space needs. Older school buildings which house many of our poorest youngsters do not have facilities for food programs and do not receive assistance to alleviate this problem.

12. Utilizing a highly educated guess, we believe there would be an increase of approximately 50% in the participation rate. This increase is limited by our high, current free lunch participation, and the rigidity of the Type A lunch pattern.

If such legislation is introduced it will receive strong support from all parties in New York State who are interested in the food services programs.

50-215 O - 75 -- 8

It is estimated that an additional $123 million would be required to support this type program in New York State.

13. The savings to the local participating agencies dollars would be minimal. The paper processing which goes on under the current system is done by persons as part of their other duties. It is unlikely that local agencies would save anything under those circumstances. Savings in staffing costs at the State level might approximate $100,000 on an annual basis.

14A. Less than 5%.

B. For those programs which use commercial transportation almost 100% charge this cost to the program - in cases where the school or institution uses their own transportation approximately 25% charge the cost to the program.

C. About 99% charge the cost of the director's operation to the program. About 25% charge the cost of clerical and bookkeeping staff who are required to maintain to normal administrative records connected with the program.

D. Not permitted by Federal Regulations.

15. The current level of State reimbursement for lunches during the 1974-75 school year is $.02 per lunch. It will be raised to $.03 for the 1975-76 school year.

For the breakfast program, New York State reimbursed participating agencies for the difference between the Federal reimbursement and the cost of producing a breakfast or $.45 whichever is less.

The average State reimbursement has remained constant over the last three years.

Currently, we receive $8,000,000 in State funds - $2.5 million for breakfast and $5.5 million for lunch.

We are hopeful that these answers will be helpful to your committee in your efforts on behalf of our child nutrition programs. We would like to thank you for providing assistance to these programs in the past and wish you good luck on your work in the future. If we, in New York State, can be helpful in the future, please do not hesitate to call on us at any time.

Sincerely,

Richard O. Reed

Richard O. Reed
Bureau Chief

January 30, 1975

--OHIO--

SENATOR MCGOVERN TELEGRAM 1-23-75
TO STATE DIRECTORS OF SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE

As was anticipated in the telegram, some of these answers are educated estimates arrived at as carefully as could be done with present information.

This information for Ohio covers public schools only. Private and parochial schools are administered by the USDA Regional Office in Chicago.

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your state each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month.)

	Paid	Free
Lunches	710,000	255,000
Breakfasts	34,588	31,014

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your state of producing a lunch this year? A Breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

	1975	1974
Lunch	.78	.72
Breakfast	.395	.355

These costs represent food, labor and supplies.

3. Has the students' price increased per lunch over last year? Per Breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so what is it?

Lunch: Increased .05 in many schools.
Increased .10 in some schools.

Breakfast: Increased about .04.

There is little loss of participation due to increased price. Decrease is mainly found in high schools where students demand more choice or a la carte foods. Wherever possible they leave the school and eat at drive-ins.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

	1975	1974
Lunch	5600	4100
Breakfast	650	Negligible

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation in your state? How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunches this year?

The increase in the RP income scale has not produced increased participation to that expected.

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

Require paying children to pay no more than the cost of food.

7. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program. Why has program participation lagged - funding? Administrative problems? Lack of Public Information? School food personnel overloaded? The "This is the Family Job" attitude?

It is often necessary to rearrange bus schedules in the morning which many principals find difficult to do.

Many boards of education will not permit schools to open early unless faculty members are there to supervise. Hourly rate for teachers is excessive for this purpose.

The attitude "This is the family job" prevails in some communities.

Some board members and administrators refuse to recognize community health, nutrition and family economic needs.

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program?

This is more of a local matter than need for legislation.

9. What, if any, modifications in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? The breakfast program?

New name for "Type A" lunch is needed. Type A is worn out.

Restructure the meal pattern to allow more foods children like -- not just foods that are "good" for them.

Managers need nutrition education to encourage them to provide more choice for high school students.

Provide a simplified milk shake formula which is smaller and still provides more nutrients than a half pint of milk.

Eliminate butter requirement. Children today don't like it on sandwiches.

High percentage of children reject vegetables.

10. (A) If the commodity program were to end, how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? Do you want the commodity program to continue? If so, how would you improve it or change it?

At least 10 cents would be needed to replace commodities.

Our major cities and large districts would prefer cash in lieu of commodities. If some foods were ever to become surplus again, issue vouchers to schools to purchase them.

10. (A) cont.

To improve present program: Eliminate foods that have low acceptability by regions such as -- rice, dry beans, purple plums, olives, raisins, prunes, lamb, sweet potatoes, grapefruit juice, sauer kraut, and perishables that reach schools in unuseable condition.

10. (B) In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

Yes. It has often been reported that schools could have purchased certain foods for the same or even less than the USDA reported cost. Some storage and handling costs could also have been avoided within the state.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? For existing programs? How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

	Needed	Expect to receive
New programs	$ 900,000	$ 330,765
Existing programs	756,000	604,170

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your state if the school lunch program were to be made universal, at 10 cents per lunch for all students? Under such a program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your state?

Possibly 75% increase in Type A lunch. Many of these students are already eating on an a la carte basis in the lunchroom. Don't believe the participation would exceed 85% of the average daily attendance.

Even with a 10¢ charge, we would still be burdened with eligibility determination and a vast amount of recordkeeping.

Allowing for the 10¢ charge and making up the current income loss from paying children, our calculation shows an estimated $185,000,000 additional would be needed.

13. How much time and money would your state save if a universal program replaced the current program, and the current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly?

This is next to impossible to put in quantitative amounts. Any such figure would be less than an educated guess.

There would be significant morale benefits on the part of principals, teachers, clerical personnel and food service personnel being relieved of current excessive recordkeeping and questionable certification practices.

13. (cont.)

There would certainly be a reduction in personnel needed to carry out present requirements, especially in large districts, even though the expanded program would require more personnel.

14. What percent of the school districts in your state charge the lunch program for the cost of:

A) Utilities? 5%

B) Transportation of USDA foods? 100%

C) School administrative overhead? None

D) Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period? 5%

15. What, if any, are the current levels of state reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three (3) years? What is the total amount of state money you currently receive?

Nothing for direct reimbursement of lunches other than the state matching requirement of approximately $2,606,000 for 1973-74.

Wade D. Bash, Director
Ohio Department of Education
School Food Service Program

WDB:jkh

JUNE GRUBBS
ASST. SUPERINTENDENT
INSTRUCTION

EARL CROOM
ASST. SUPERINTENDENT
STATE FOOD SERVICE

CECIL POLK
ASST. SUPERINTENDENT
FINANCE

State Department of Education

LESLIE FISHER, Superintendent
E. H. McDONALD, Deputy Superintendent
LLOYD GRAHAM, Associate Deputy Superintendent

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

February 11, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator:

We are once again honored to respond to the Committee's telegram concerning the status of Child Nutrition Programs in our state. Realizing the results of last year's telegram, we hope our response will help the Committee in its evaluation of programs we feel vital to the youth of today.

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your state each day? Paid: 224,275 Free: 113,243 Breakfasts? Paid: 4,901 Free: 18,427

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your state of producing a lunch this year? 73.35¢ Breakfast? 29.85¢ How does this compare to last year? Lunch: 64.08¢ Breakfast: 25.32¢

3. Has the students' price increased per lunch over last year? Yes. Per breakfast? Yes. How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Lunch: 4.2¢ Breakfast: 1.3¢
Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? Yes. If so, what is it? We have experienced a 4-5% decrease in paid student meals, with an increase in free and reduced price student meals. We feel the decrease in paid meals can be attributed to both, the increase in price to the child and the increase in the eligibility scale for free and reduced price meals.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? 4,937. Breakfasts? 262. How do these figures compare with last year at this time? Lunch: 161.5% increase. Breakfast: 11.5% decrease.

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation in your state? Reduced price participation has shown a definite increase over previous year. We feel the expanded reduced price meal program is reaching: 1) children who did not participate before because they could not afford the full charge, or; 2) children who participated before at the full charge, but did so at a financial disadvantage. How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunches this year? 83 Districts

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program? 1) The teaching of nutrition needs to be expanded, improved and required; 2) Personnel operating the programs must be technically trained; and 3) Dining facilities need to be improved. To accomplish the above, money is needed to employ nutrition education specialists and for training of school foodservice personnel. Regulations make it difficult to use the money that was authorized by legislation. Public information programs are needed to create interest in nutrition.

7. The school breakfast program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program. Why has program participation lagged: We feel all the reasons mentioned below have contributed to the slow progress of the program; funding, administrative problems, lack of public information, school food personnel overloaded, and the "this is the family job" attitude.

8. What changes, if any, in legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program? Require, rather than, recommend that protein-rich foods be served - and how often. Increase reimbursement accordingly.

9 What, if any, modifications in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? the breakfast program? The meal pattern does not nave to be changed. We need highly trained and educated people administering the program. People who have the initiative and creativity to offer what students want within the framework of the Type A lunch. When students have a choice and can make a selection of foods the plate waste is automatically reduced.

10. A) If the commodity program were to end, how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? 14¢ Do you want the commodity program to continue? Yes. If so, how would you improve it or change it? By supplying practical rather than surplus foods which could be used more effectively.
B) In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? No. If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

ITEM	*USDA	**SCHOOL	DIFFERENCE
Frozen Frankfurters	.683	.78	.097
Frozen Turkey	.4283	.58	.1517
Process Cheese	.77	1.00	.23

* Taken from USDA cost list for first half of FY 75.
** Represents only one school district, located in metropolitan area. Prices do not represent the many small rural districts in our state.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? None. For existing programs? $2,570,192. How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year? New Programs: $2,392. Existing: $207,878.

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your state if the school lunch program were to be made universal, at 10¢ per lunch to all students? 30% Would you favor such a program? Yes. Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your state? Approximately $11,816,783. In addition to what has already been authorized for FY 1975.

13. How much time and money would your state save if a universal program replaced the current program, and the current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly? Approximately 60% statewide.

14. What percent of the school districts in your state charge the lunch program for the cost of:

Utilities: 5-6%
Transportation of USDA Foods: 5-6%
School Administrative Overhead: 5-6%
Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period: 1-2%

15. What, if any, are the current levels of state reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? .013 Breakfasts? None. How much has this increased in the last three (3) years? .003 What is the total amount of state money you currently receive? 1975 FY - $825,000.

If we can be of further service, please contact us at any time.

Sincerely,

Fred L. Jones

Fred L. Jones, Director
School Lunch Section

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Hayes Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Thomas C. Schmidt, Commissioner

February 3, 1975

The Honorable George F. McGovern
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Senator McGovern:

I have received your telegram requesting information on school food service programs in Rhode Island. The comments below respond directly to the questions raised in this communication:

1.

	Public (ADP)	Non-Public (ADP)	
Paid Lunches	33,807	2,245	36052
Free Lunches	31,443	495	31938
Reduced Price Lunches	2,692	147	
Paid Breakfasts	497	65	562
Free Breakfasts	3,982	60	4042
Reduced Price Breakfasts	99	22	

2.

	FY 1974	FY 1975
Average Cost of Lunch	.807	.888 (Projected)
Average Cost of Breakfast	.215	.256

3.

Price of Lunch	.45 (El.) .50 (Sec.)	.45 (El.) .50 (Sec.)

4.

Number Reduced Price Lunches	1,670 (ADP)	2,839 (ADP)
Number Reduced Price Breakfasts	47 (ADP)	99 (ADP)

5. Increase in quidelines brought a significant increase in participation - however, below the increase anticipated. All school districts offer reduced price lunches to eligible children.

6. Universal school lunch would provide some relief to middle income families and support better nutrition among children in this group.

7. Increased participation in breakfast programs has not been anticipated because of the inflexibility of transportation and scheduling systems which are an integral part of the school program.

8. Legislation is not indicated as a support for the breakfast program.

9. Modifications in program to reduce waste and increase participation should proceed at the local level.

10a. 10¢ per lunch would probably compensate for loss of commodities. However, our schools prefer to receive commodities.

10b. We do not believe it possible to purchase locally as cheaply as USDA and achieve a product of uniform quality.

11. Funds received for equipment for new program schools $ 40,065
Funds received for equipment for existing programs 44,368

Needs in new program schools - present funds are adequate for claims received to date.
Needs in existing programs - claims to date total $ 187,009
Additional inquiries have been received and claims anticipated. As much as $3 million could be used to develop a cost effective system for the state.

12. We believe present participation of 72,844 or 43% of ADA would increase 100% with the advent of universal lunch. This would increase participation to about 140,000 or approximately 86% of ADA. This would increase federal funding from about $6.7 million to $15.2 million. To expand present facilities to accommodate this increase in participation, about $2 million would be needed in non-food assistance funds.

13. The State would probably save only about $20,000 in a universal lunch situation where federal reimbursement increased to the actual cost of the lunch. Local communities would save approximately $500,000 in wages to clerks, register workers and personnel involved with applications and guidelines.

14. All locally sponsored food service programs
    (a) include utility costs as an indirect cost of the meal
    (b) include transportation as a direct cost of the meal
    (c) include administrative overhead as an indirect cost
    (d) do not include employment of a supervisor as a cost of the meal

15. The state appropriation for school food service follows:

FY 1973	1,659,273
FY 1974	1,975,568
FY 1975	3,371,937

I trust you will find this information helpful. Best wishes in your efforts to support and improve school food services for the children in our schools.

Sincerely,

Robert F Kaveny

Robert F. Kaveny, Program Business Manager
Office of School Food Services

RFK:ea

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CYRIL B. BUSBEE
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

COLUMBIA

January 27, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
Chairman, U. S. Senate Select Committee
on Nutrition and Human Needs
Washington, D. C. 20250

Dear Senator McGovern:

In reply to your telegram, I am happy to submit the following information relative to South Carolina's Child Nutrition Programs in the order which you have requested.

1. Number of paid lunches served daily this year - 197,334
   Number of free lunches served daily this year - 247,063

   Number of paid breakfasts served daily this year - 1,657
   Number of free breakfasts served daily this year - 28,731

2. The average cost of producing a lunch this year is approximately 68¢. The average cost of producing a breakfast this year is 34¢, as compared to 64¢ and 30¢ respectively for last year.

3. The students' price has increased by approximately 5¢ per lunch and breakfast over last year's charge. Since our participation has not dropped, we cannot correlate price increase with loss of participation.

4. Number of reduced price lunches served daily this year - 14,766
   Number of reduced price breakfasts served daily this year - 876, as compared to 8,731 lunches and 560 breakfasts served last year at reduced prices.

5. All districts (93) have initiated the reduced price lunches this year and our overall participation is up by 1% over last year.

6. We continue to endorse a universal feeding program for all children so that proper nutrition will be available to all students.

7. Breakfast program participation has lagged due to administrative problems and "this is the family job" attitude.

8. No recommendation.

9. In view of the current food crisis, we think that a high school youngster should be allowed to refuse one of the basic four components, other than milk, of the Type A pattern and still receive full Federal reimbursement. Plate waste in the breakfast program is negligible.

10A. We heartily endorse the continuance of the commodity program since we believe that 10¢ worth of commodities purchased by the Federal government would cost the school districts no less than 15¢ if purchased locally. Furthermore, we are now geared to effectively administer the program with warehouses and trucking equipment. Especially would we like to receive flour and oils in future allocations.

10B. If the schools purchase frozen beans, 30 lb. box, the cost is $12.90 U.S.D.A. price is $7.83. If the schools purchase canned beans (Blue Lake Quality) the price is $9.81 for 6/10's. U.S.D.A. price is $7.24.

11. Since 100% of our public schools participate in the National School Lunch Program, this question for new programs does not apply. For existing programs, however, at least twice the current appropriation is needed to replace obsolete and worn out equipment in schools having over the state average of free and reduced price recipients. $275,793 is expected for Nonfood Assistance this year and we could well use $600,000 for FY 76.

12. Perhaps 5-7% increase in participation would be expected if the school lunch program were made universal. Since receipts from paying students totaled $16 million last year for the school lunch program, we believe that universal lunch would cost an additional $25 million in Federal funding in South Carolina. If the cost were 10¢ for all children, obviously many of our current free students would not be able to have lunch unless food stamps could be used to pay for lunch. This may well be the solution to reduce bookkeeping. I would hesitate to estimate the additional money needed to have such a program in South Carolina.

13. If a universal program replaced the current program, at least $1 million in paper work alone would be saved by the local school districts, not including approximately 50,000 manhours spent by local superintendents and administrators in administering the current program. These are conservative estimates.

14. The following percent of school districts charge the lunch program for the cost of:
    A. Utilities - 35%
    B. Transportation of USDA foods - 40%
    C. School administrative overhead (very negligible)
    D. Employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period - None

15. No reimbursement per meal is made from State appropriation for lunch or breakfast. Our state matching money for FY 76 will amount to approximately $3½ million.

These monies are used primarily for salaries of local supervisors, state health insurance program for all school food service employees and a general appropriation for paying necessary expenditures connected with school food services.

We genuinely appreciate your dedicated interest in the Child Nutrition Programs; and if we can be of further assistance to you, please advise.

Sincerely,

David S. Matthews

David S. Matthews, Director
Office of School Food Services

DSM:gqj

department of education and cultural affairs

Division of Elementary and Secondary Education

State Capitol Building,
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

February 14, 1975

Senator George McGovern, Chairman
Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
2313 Dirksen Senate Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

The following information is in response to your wire requesting information relative to Child Nutrition Programs.

1. The number of paid lunches served in South Dakota on the average daily is 90,200 and the number of free lunches 26,800.
2. The average cost of producing a Type A lunch in our state this year will exceed 90 cents. The average cost of a non-protein breakfast is about 33 cents. These costs are up about 20% from last year.
3. The students' price per lunch has increased about 5¢ over last year and breakfast about 3.5¢. If we were not making an extra effort to increase participation this year, our student loss would probably be from five to ten per cent.
4. Approximately 3,000 reduced price lunches are served daily and about 200 breakfasts. More than twice as many students are receiving reduced price lunches and breakfasts as last year. The pride factor keeps many families from applying who would qualify.

5. The expanded reduced price lunches has doubled the number of participants over last year. An additional 32 school districts or about 15% of the total in the state have initiated reduced price lunches this year.
6. In order to stop the loss of paying students from the lunch program the price asked should be kept below 50¢ per lunch.
7. The school breakfast program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program because of philosophy. Many boards of education, who generally are upper middle income, as are school administrators refuse to recognize the need for the breakfast program. Many school food service personnel are overburdened and there are some administrative problems which cause a hold back.
8. There should be much more information from the media as to the need for breakfasts for children. The medical profession needs to get involved in nutrition. Educators must be made to realize that proper nutrition and learning go hand in hand. Perhaps we need legislation to say that if a school has the National School Lunch Program then breakfast should be offered.
9. The modifications in the meal pattern must be left to the ingenuity of the school food service personnel. The Type A pattern is a must unless the nutrient standard approach can be adapted to the needs of an average program. Students should be offered choices and should be involved with the programs. Breakfast patterns certainly must include as a minimum milk, juice and bread or cereal.

10. If the commodity program were to end at least 15¢ per meal would be needed to offset the loss. The commodity program must continue and flour and other cereal products should again be made available.

    The use of bids using standards of quality presently found in USDA donated foods is impossible in 95% of South Dakota schools. If the quality standards were reduced slightly by USDA bids at lower rates could more easily be gotten and passed on to the schools. USDA has specific information and research available on a quality basis if they will make it available. We need a change of philosophy by the USDA and a change of leadership.

11. Equipment needs for new programs are minimal as all but four independent districts with schools in excess of 100 enrollment are in the National School Lunch Program. We could use between $200,000 and $300,000 for existing programs if we could match on a 75%-25% basis. We have been allocated $60,985 this year for existing programs and $20,823 for no-program schools.

12. If the school lunch program were to be made a free universal lunch in South Dakota it should anticipate a 20 to 30 per cent increase in participation bringing participation to 85%. At ten cents per lunch for all children we should continue to have the problems of collection and also the low income families. I am completely opposed to such a program because it would be a farce to collect a dime with per lunch costs reaching nearly a dollar.

I disagree with those who maintain there is a great deal of cheating under the present system. I feel most South Dakota families who are borderline with the income scale continue to pay for the feeding of their own children as well as paying the costs of those less fortunate through the federal income tax.

A federal budget of 3.5 billion along with state and local effort would supply the needs of all those who wish to eat at school. This is a small amount when compared with a ninety billion dollar military budget.

13. It is difficult to estimate how much time and money South Dakota would save if a universal program replaced the current program. We cannot assume that federal would pick up the total tab.

The current certification procedure is not all bad. The economic conditions of many families are being analyzed as never before and so are the children who were born to less fortunate circumstances. Perhaps this interest by principals or other certifiers who should be humanitarians has centered attention on the underprivileged child as never before.

14. The percent of school districts in South Dakota which charge the lunch program for the following costs are:

    A. Utilities--5% estimate

    B. Transportation of USDA foods--paid from state matching funds

    C. School administrative overhead--15% estimate

    D. Supervisors during lunch period--20% estimate

15. During fiscal 1975 in addition to paying the costs of transportation charges to public schools for USDA foods each public school will receive about one and one-half cents per meal in state funds. This is an increase of 100 per cent over the past three years. Next year reimbursement per lunch may reach three cents. The total amount of money requested from the legislature for fiscal 1976 is $496,800. To the present time this seems to be acceptable to legislators. This is one school program for which they can see tangible results from the money invested.

I believe during a period of hard times such as we are now experiencing attention should be focused on proper nutrition for people as never before. TV programs and especially those which children watch on Saturday mornings could play a tremendous role. "Sesame Street" and "Fat Albert" have good followings yet seldom is proper eating or nutrition mentioned. Isn't "Sesame Street" funded directly from foundations which get tax breaks as, of course, do the sponsors of "Fat Albert".

I know you and your committee have all the facts and need no further input from me.

Thank you for your continuing interest in proper nutrition for people and Good Luck!

Sincerely yours,

Martin Sorensen

Martin Sorensen, Administrator
School Food Services

MS:dm

cc: Senator James Abourezk
Congressman James Abdnor
Congressman Larry Pressler

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

1400 UNIVERSITY CLUB BUILDING, 136 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE STREET
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84111

WALTER D. TALBOT, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

January 31, 1975

Senator George McGovern
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to forward answers to certain questions you have regarding the Child Nutrition Programs.

We appreciate your interest in the welfare of our children and the support you especially give to the School Lunch Program.

Attached is the information you requested. If we can furnish additional information please let us know.

Sincerely,

Cliff D. Snow, Coordinator
School Food Services Program

CDS:ag
Enclosure

JAY J. CAMPBELL, Deputy Superintendent
Office of Administration and Institution Services

CLIFF D. SNOW, Administrator
Division of School Food Services
Telephone (801) 328-5471

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

1400 UNIVERSITY CLUB BUILDING, 136 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE STREET
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84111

WALTER D. TALBOT, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

	1973-74	1974-75
Number of Paid Lunches Daily	159,983	156,303
Number of Free Lunches Daily	24,116	26,646
Number of Reduced Price Lunches Daily	913	5,751
Number of Paid Breakfasts Daily	600	635
Number of Free Breakfasts Daily	1,309	1,594
Number of Reduced Price Breakfasts Daily	0	75
Average Cost to Produce a Lunch	$.6365	$.7135
Average Cost to Produce a Breakfast	.3202	.4182
Average Charge to Student Per Lunch	.3619	.4000
Average Charge to Student Per Breakfast	.1875	.2313

1. What has been the effect of expanded reduced price scale on participation?
   a. Increased number of free and reduced price meals.
2. How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunch this year?
   a. 27
3. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the Lunch Program?
   a. Charge every child 10 cents per lunch (donut operation only)
   b. Make reimbursements higher on all lunches, rather than stressing the free and reduced lunch reimbursement.
4. Why has the Breakfast Program not expanded at the same rate as the Lunch Program?
   a. Is of shorter duration.
   b. Population feels family should provide breakfast
   c. Bus schedules.

MAY J. CAMPBELL, Deputy Superintendent
Office of Administration and Institution Services

CLIFF D. SHOW, Administrator
Division of School Food Services
Telephone (801) 328-5671

5. Why has breakfast participation lagged?

   a. Most families feel breakfast should be provided at home.

   b. Breakfast programs are successful only in schools that have a considerable number of free lunches.

   c. Reimbursements minimum, no incentive.

6. What changes, if any, in legislation would help improve the participation rate and the quality of the Breakfast Programs?

   a. Eliminate separate record keeping.

   b. Do not tie reimbursement to the cost to produce the breakfast.

7. What, if any modifications in the meal pattern of the lunch should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste?

   a. Lunch Program. Offer either juice or milk, not both.

   We suggest that the "Type A School Lunch Guide to the Amounts of Food for Boys and Girls of Specified Ages" be incorporated as part of the type A lunch pattern regulations. The present regulation endorses the adjustment for different age levels but has a limited amount of food adjustment. A wider range is needed to meet the varying needs of children.

   The type A lunch pattern should be changed so that a more realistic volume of foods is achieved for primary grades (K - 3), particularly the milk requirement.

   In the "Type A Lunch Guide to the Amounts of Food for Children of Specified Ages" the only provision for a reduction in the volume of foods served for the 6 - 10 year olds (primary grades) is a lesser amount of cooked beans or peas and peanut butter. Yet the volume capacity for these children may be considerably less than the older children. Experience with our children in Utah tends to indicate that many of these small children can not consume a full one-half pint of milk along with the other components of the type A lunch. The guide should be reviewed before it's inclusion in the regulations.

   Meat/Meat Alternate Section

   According to the requirement, in order to be counted in meeting the meat/-meat alternate requirement the high protein foods must be served in a main dish or main dish and one other item. We fail to see the nutritional advantage of this for it seems immaterial where the protein source is used as long as the required level is achieved for the total meal. Perhaps

the allowable serving for the meat/meat alternate requirement should be more equal in protein value, i.e. two ounces edible meat or three tablespoons peanut butter, or two eggs.

To meet one-third of the RDA for 10 - 12 year olds is the goal of the type A lunch pattern. This would be approximately 14 grams of protein per lunch. It is generally accepted that a two-ounce serving of meat/-meat alternate will yield 14 grams of protein, one-half pint of milk 8 grams making a total of 22 grams which is well above the RDA goal without even considering the bread or dessert item which generally will yield additional proteins.

Fruit and Vegetable Section

The fruit and vegetable section of the type A lunch pattern appears to be adequate, however, USDA's interpretation in the Food Buying Guide, which is used as the tool to determine compliance, has some inconsistencies which need revision, explanation and clarification.

Bread Section

From a nutritional standpoint, why is rice not acceptable in Hawaii as a bread substitute? It has long been an acceptable substitute (similar nutritional value) in hospitals and other types of food services so that it should be incorporated into the bread requirement for type A lunches.

Milk Section

We feel the previous change to allow all types of milk has increased participation and decreased waste, as well as giving greater student satisfaction. The majority of our schools are using two-percent milk.

There are inconsistencies throughout the nation regarding the use of milk shakes to meet the type A requirement for one-half pint fluid milk. Since many companies use a mix made up of nonfat dry milk we fail to see the difference nutritionally in the use of "fluid" milk as compared to dry milk reconstituted as stated in the regulations.

More attention needs to be paid to the nutritional standing of the food and how it fits into the total meal. Allowing competent nutritionists to make these decisions would be more valuable than all the regulating done in Washington; but guidelines established do not hold the weight of regulations to administrators of programs, therefore, the above regulation changes are necessary to benefit the children.

b. Breakfast Program: Because of the volume of liquid, generally milk and juice is too much for the students.

Milk and fruit is adequate, but milk and juice served together is too much, and fruit is not always available.

8. If the Commodity Program were to end, how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss?

   a. Eleven to twelve cents per meal.

9. Do you want the Commodity Program to continue?

   a. Yes.

   If so, how would you improve the Commodity Program?

   a. Purchase protein foods.

   b. Purchase fruits and vegetables of good nutritional value.

   c. Let states know early in the year what foods will be purchased.

10. In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them assuming equal quality?

    a. No. Not the same quality.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs?

    a. $25,000

    For existing programs?

    a. $175,000

12. How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

    a. New programs: $18,000

    b. Existing programs: $116,000

13. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in the School Lunch Program in your state if the School Lunch Program were to be made universal?

    a. Approximately 25 percent.

14. Would you favor such a program?

    a. Yes.

    b. Some schools would find it difficult to handle the increased participation with their present facilities and equipment.

15. Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your state?

    a. Approximately $17,500,000 at 10 cents per student meal.

16. How much time and money would your state save if a universal program replaced the current program?

    a. We do not know how much to expect the state or federal to pay under such a program.

    And if the current certification and reporting paper work were replaced accordingly?

    a. This item is difficult to determine. Not all districts charge these procedures to the program. There will always have to be records kept.

17. What percent of the school districts in your state charge the Lunch Program for the following costs?

    a. Utilities? 100%

    b. Transportation of USDA Foods? 100%

    c. School Administrative Overhead? 100%

    d. Employment of Personnel for Supervision in Lunch Room? 100%

18. What, if any, are the current levels of state reimbursements you receive for lunches this year?

    a. Lunches? .07 cents

    b. Breakfasts? 0

    How much has this increased the last three years?

    a. .01 cent per lunch

19. What is the total amount of state money you currently receive?

    a. $2,500,000

STATE OF VERMONT
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MONTPELIER
05602

January 30, 1975

Senator George McGovern, Chairman
United States Senate
Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
Senate Annex Building
127 C Street, Northeast
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

Vermont's Department of Education Child Nutrition Program staff has received your telegram and offer the following comments.

1. Average number paid lunches served each day -- 37,681
   Average number free lunches served each day -- 16,943
   Average number paid breakfasts served each day -- 472
   Average number free breakfasts served each day -- 511

2. Average cost of producing a lunch and breakfast:

	This Year	Last Year
Lunch	$ .7902	$ .6702
Breakfast	.3750	.2980

3. Student price increase over last year:

Lunch	Average $ .05
Breakfast	None

   While a loss in participation because of increased charge to the child cannot be determined at this time, overall, paid lunches have decreased by 4.8 percent; free lunches served have increased by 3.2 percent, and reduced lunches served have increased 1.6 percent.

4. Reduced price lunches served each day - this year - 2,687
   Reduced price breakfasts served each day - this year - 35

   Reduced priced lunches have increased 90.8% over last year
   (Sept-Nov '73: 69,872; Sept-Nov '74: 133,337)

   Reduced priced breakfasts served - 84.8% increase over last year
   (Sept-Nov '73: 746; Sept-Nov '74: 1,379)

5. Participation in reduced price lunches to total lunches served has increased 1.6 percent. The State Board of Education's policy in Vermont requires that all schools offer reduced price lunches.

6. Legislation for universal free school lunch would have the most positive affect to help stop the loss of the paying student.

7. Low participation in the breakfast program is due partly to attitude particularly by school administrators that "this is the family job." School Food Service overload is a definite contributing factor as well as the additional recordkeeping needed, plus the fact that bus scheduling prevents many schools from participating.

8. Additional Federal Legislation would not help improve the participation in the breakfast program in Vermont.

9. More emphasis and funding for Nutrition Education is necessary for increased participation and decreased waste instead of modification in meal patterns.

10. Vermont is strongly opposed to ending the commodity program. A small state such as Vermont does not have the purchasing power to obtain prices as favorable as those secured nationally. The Department of Agriculture should continue to purchase commodities.

b. Some rural areas of Vermont are not serviced by local wholesalers. No local schools in Vermont could purchase supplies as cheaply as the Department of Agriculture is able to, quality could not be equaled.

11. Equipment Needs:

New Programs	-	$213,000.00 (Estimate)
Existing Programs	-	$ 55,000.00 (Estimate)

FY 1975 Appropriation:

New Programs	-	$29,112.00
Existing Programs	-	$30,395.00

12. Estimated 20 percent would be anticipated in Vermont if the school lunch program were to be made universal. A universal program at 10 cents per lunch cost for all students would be favored. It is estimated that Vermont would need at the minimum, $7,438,523.00. This estimate is based on current per plate cost and takes into consideration, state reimbursement, child charge and school board's recommended contribution.

13. State and local saving would occur to some degree with elimination of some paperwork, i.e. free and reduced policy. Additional staff would be needed to monitor new and existing programs.

14. All schools in Vermont have been instructed to claim indirect costs. The percentage of schools that are handling this directive correctly cannot be determined at this time.

15. The current level of state reimbursement on lunches this year- - $ .0250, breakfasts--0. There has been no substantial increase over the previous three years. Total state appropriation for fiscal year 1975 - $225,000.00.

If further information is needed, please contact us.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Banba A. Foley, R. D.
Chief, Child Nutrition Programs

BAF/kc

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND. 23216

January 31, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
United States Senate
Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

In response to the questions in your telegram of January 23, I submit the following information:

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your state each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month).

Average meals per day served in November, 1974

Lunch:	Full Price	400,342
	Free	226,284
Breakfast:	Full Price	3,703
	Free	17,569

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your state of producing a lunch this year? A Breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

Estimate of Average Cost of Producing Meals

	1973-74	1974-75
Lunch	.6069	.72
Breakfast	.2734	.31

3. Has the students' price increased per lunch over last year? Per Breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so what is it?

Average increase in student price for meals:

Lunch	.05
Breakfast	.05

There is a possibility that many schools will increase the price another 5 cents before the end of the present school year.

In past years schools have experienced a decrease of 5-10 percent in participation when the price for meals were increased. This year the average number of full price meals did not decrease significantly. It is anticipated that another increase this year will result in a large drop in the participation of paying students.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

Average Reduced Price meals per day (November)

	1973	1974
Lunch	4,384	13,266
Breakfast	86	389

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation in your state? How many school districts have initiated the reduced price lunches this year?

The expanded Reduced Price program has not increased total participation. Due to the increased spread of reduced price income levels, school districts were more receptive to offering reduced prices. Thus, more students become eligible for reduced price meals.

Thirty-eight additional school districts initiated the reduced price program this year. Of the 135 school districts in Virginia, 75 are now providing reduced price meals.

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

Funds be made available to support a strong nutrition education program in each school.

Have a universal free lunch program or a universal price for all students.

Revise the Type A meal requirements for high school students.

7. The school breakfast program has not expanded at the same rate as the lunch program. Why has program participation lagged funding? Administrative problems? Lack of public information? School food personnel overloaded? The "This is the Family Job" attitude?

Many administrators have the attitude that breakfast is not a school responsibility.

Administering the present free and reduced price program will add to problems and paper work.

Administrators state that bus schedules will not permit a breakfast program.

There is a fear that the income will not be sufficient to cover the additional labor and other expenses.

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program?

Establish a universal program either free or 5 cents, for all students. This would eliminate the administrative problems and paperwork resulting from the free and reduced price program.

9. What, if any, modifications in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? The breakfast program?

The size serving of the various components of the meal pattern should be reduced for children ages 6-9.

Change the vegetable/fruit requirement to ½-cup for children ages 6-12.

10. A) If the commodity program were to end how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? Do you want the commodity program to continue? If so, how would you improve it or change it?
B) In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as the USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

A) It is estimated that schools would need a minimum of 15 cents per meal to offset the loss of commodities. I strongly recommend the continuation of the commodity program.

It would be most helpful if schools knew prior to the opening of the school term the commodities to be received, the arrival date, and the amount. This information can then be used in menu planning, purchasing, etc.

B) The large school districts can purchase as cheaply as the U.S.D.A. This is due to having professionally trained personnel to write specifications bid buying, large quantity purchases, and having large storage facilities. The smaller districts do not have those advantages.

The cost of ground beef ranged from a low of .6648 to $1.02 per pound. The low cost being in a large division doing centralized purchasing. The high cost was by a small school with limited sources from which to purchase. It is questionable that the local purchases are as high quality as the donated foods.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? For existing programs? How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

All existing public schools in Virginia have food service facilities. Non-food assistance is needed for equipment replacement and for additional equipment to meet program needs. It is estimated there is a present need for $490,000 for this purpose.

Virginia has received $401,695 unrestricted equipment funds and $471 in restricted funds.

12. What percentage increase in participation would you expect in your state if the school lunch program were to be made universal, at 10 cents per lunch for all students? Under such a program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your state?

Total participation is presently 66% of students in Average Daily Attendance. It is estimated that with a 10 cent universal program the participation will increase to 90% of students.

13. How much time and money would your state save if a universal program replaced the current program, and the current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly?

It is estimated that schools and school districts devote 1.25 million manhours in the printing and distributing of required letter, applications, and scale; reviewing and certifying applications; notifying parents of action taken on application; distributing and handling tickets; reporting proceedures, etc.

The above manhours represent an estimated cost of $7,000,000.

14. What percent of the school districts in your state charge the lunch program for the cost of:

		%
A.	Utilities	32%
B.	Transportation of U.S.D.A. Foods	20%
C.	School Administrative Overhead	12%
D.	Employment of Personnel For Supervision during lunch period	2%

15. What, If any, are the current levels of state reimbursements you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three (3) years? What is the total amount of state money you currently receive?

Lunch -- State funds paid to school districts for lunch reimbursement

	FY 1973	FY 1975
Per lunch	.0067	.01734
Total Amount	$768,888	$1,957,110

$2,931,405 is available for FY 1976.

Breakfast -- No State funds are appropriated for the Breakfast Program.

If this office can provide further information, please contace me.

Sincerely,

John F. Miller,
State Supervisor
School Food Service

JFM:jw

SPI **Superintendent of Public Instruction**
DR. FRANK B. BROUILLET · OLD CAPITOL BLDG., OLYMPIA, WASH. 98504

February 7, 1975

Senator George McGovern
Senate Select Committee on
Nutrition and Human Needs
U. S. Senate Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

This letter is in response to your teletype of January 24, 1975.

1. November, 1974

	Free	Reduced Price	Paid	Total
Lunch	80,236	15,062	202,853	298,151
Breakfast	10,056	765	3,204	14,025

2. We estimate the average cost in our state of producing a lunch at 70¢ and breakfast at 40¢. The estimate for last year was 67¢ for lunch and 35¢ for breakfast.

3. Lunch prices were increased in 114 school districts this year:

No. of School Districts	Increase Per Meal
85	5¢
25	10¢
3	15¢
1	20¢

These school districts represent 30.4% of the total participation in the program. The average daily participation for November, 1973 was 93,078 and for November, 1974 it was 90,716. This is a decrease of 2.6%.

The percent of participation in the lunch program has increased state-wide approximately 2%.

Total enrollment has dropped approximately 0.7% (7/10 of one percent).

Breakfast prices were increased in 11 school districts this year:

No. of School Districts	Increase Per Meal
8	5¢
3	10¢

The average daily participation for November, 1973 was 6,300 and for November, 1974 it was 7,185. This is an increase of 14%.

There is a decrease in participation among the paying students but it cannot be determined whether it is due to the higher eligibility guidelines for reduced price meals or to increases in the selling prices of meals.

4. Reduced Price Lunches: November, 1973 7,635 per day
November, 1974 15,062 per day
(Increase of 97.3%)

Reduced Price Breakfasts: November, 1973 278 per day
November, 1974 765 per day
(Increase of 175.2%)

5. 1974 Fiscal Year--16 School Districts Did Not Offer Reduced Price Lunches
255 School Districts Did Offer Reduced Price Lunches

1975 Fiscal Year--10 School Districts Do Not Offer Reduced Price Lunches
258 School Districts Do Offer Reduced Price Lunches

Refer to "4" for the effect of the expanded reduced price program.

6. Increased Section 4 reimbursement. More timely information on reimbursement rates and other Federal support of the program. This has improved but there is still a long way to go.

7. This is not applicable in the State of Washington.

8. None.

9. Make provivision for milk alternates, i.e., yogurt and commercial shake mix. Improve the ability of menu writers and cooks. This would help more than changing the meal pattern.

10. A) For the current year, 15c per meal. In some smaller, remote school districts it would be more. Some of the school districts would rather have cash than commodities.

In many ways, the programs would be easier to administer if there was no food distribution program, i.e., planning would be easier if we were receiving all cash.

B) The cost of obtaining food depends a great deal upon the size and location of a school district.

11. Equipment Needs for New Programs: $250,000
Existing Programs: $185,000

Reserved Funds--Fiscal Year 1975: $79,778
Unreserved Funds--Fiscal Year 1975: $182,892

12. Expected Increase: 25-35% Our current participation is 42-43%.

Currently, 92.4% of the public school children in this state are attending schools participating in the National School Lunch Program.

No, for there are many poor who could not afford even ten cents (10c).

13. Besides time and money, we are sure that the interest in and support of the food service programs by school administrators would increase immeasurably with the elimination of the current certification and reporting paperwork involved in the free and reduced price lunch program.

14. The listed items are part of the cost of operating food service programs and as such should be shown in the accounting process.

Federal reimbursement and children's payments do not cover the cost of operating the programs. Thus, State and local funds must also be used to support the program.

15. The Superintendent of Public Instruction budget request currently under consideration by the Legislature for Fiscal Year 1976 is $3,836,677.

We hope this information is helpful to you.

Very truly yours,

Virginia R. Whitlatch

(Miss) Virginia R. Whitlatch
Supervisor, Food Services

VRW:cmw

State of West Virginia
Department of Education
Charleston
25305

DANIEL B. TAYLOR
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
OF SCHOOLS

January 28, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
United States Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Congress
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

We have received your recent telegram requesting current information concerning the Child Nutrition Programs administered by the West Virginia Department of Education. Since this department administers the programs only in the public schools, information concerning private school participation must be obtained from the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Approximately 97,598 West Virginia school children pay the full price for their school lunches each day while 71,401 have applied for and receive a free lunch. In the 317 schools which participate in the school breakfast program, 6,179 pay the full price for their breakfasts each day while 20,871 students have applied for and receive a free breakfast.

Currently, the average cost of producing a school lunch in West Virginia, including county subsidies is approximately 85 cents. The average cost of producing a school breakfast is 35 cents. These costs are approximately 15 per cent higher than costs during the fiscal year of 1974.

Student prices for the school lunch and the school breakfast have increased by five to ten cents per meal from January, 1974 to January, 1975. Participation in the National School Lunch Program dropped by 3,000 students during the spring of 1974 and has not increased markedly from this level. Since the number of students approved for free and reduced price lunches has increased during this time period, we assume that the drop in participation has been a result of these increased prices.

Approximately 43,339 students receive a reduced price school lunch each day while 20,871 receive a reduced price lunch and 17,984 received a reduced price breakfast. This marked increase is due to the state-wide adoption of the expanded reduce price eligibility standards.

The number of schools participating in the school breakfast program has increased by 37 from fiscal year 1974. Most schools are hesitant to participate in the school breakfast program for one or more of the following reasons: increased record keeping requirements; lack of personnel; limited equipment and facilities; hesitancy to participate since the "freeze" on breakfast programs which occurred several years ago due to limited funding.

Changes in legislation which would help increase particpation in the school food service programs would be an initiation of a "reduced" price school lunch and breakfast which would reduce record keeping requirements and accountability problems as well as protecting the anonimity of the child. It is estimated that participation in the school lunch program would increase to 90 per cent as compared to the current 65 per cent level of participation. Since, in West Virginia, 55 per cent of all lunches served generally are free or at a reduced price, a substantial saving in record keeping expenses could be realized.

Provision of a supplemental or "snack" meal in the public schools similar to that used in the Special Food Service Program would increase participation in child feeding programs at the kindergarten level as well as at the junior and senior high school level.

In reply to your request for information concerning the need for government-donated foods, this program is essential in this state. If the provision of government-donated foods were discontinued, at least 20 cents per lunch would be needed to replace this subsidy. This amount would be needed to establish a purchasing system in many small counties where personnel are not available to purchase foods. In all events, procurement of foods, delivery and storage would be a serious problem in the more rural areas of this state.

For the fiscal year of 1976, we estimate that approximately $185,000 will be needed to establish new programs in 11 of the 15 "no program" schools in West Virginia. Another $54,000 will be needed for expansion of existing programs and $553,000 will be needed for maintenance of existing programs in schools serving children from low income families. The funds allocated for non-food assistance in West Virginia for fiscal year 1975 are $18,427 in funds reserved for "no program" schools and $143,128 for maintenance and expansion of existing school food service programs. No provision has been made to assist school districts with school consolidation programs.

The total amount of state money appropriated as State Aid for Cooks' Salaries has increased from $700,000 to $850,000 during the past three years. A request for $925,000 has been included in the State's budget request for fiscal year 1976.

We take this opportunity to thank you for your continued interest and support of the child nutrition programs. Please contact this office if we may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Faith Gravenmier

Faith Gravenmier, Director
School Food Services

FG/n

State of Wisconsin DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Barbara Thompson, Ph.D.
State Superintendent

Dwight M. Stevens, Ph.D.
Deputy State Superintendent

DIVISION FOR SCHOOL BOARD AND ADMINISTRATOR SERVICES
Donald E. Dimick, Assistant Superintendent

February 10, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern, Chairman
U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

The following data is provided in response to your telegram request for information about the National School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Food Service and Commodity Programs operating in Wisconsin's public schools. The operating date is for October, 1974.

1) a) Paid for lunches served daily 327,531
   b) Free lunches served daily 78,729
   c) Paid for breakfasts served daily. 4,955
   d) Free breakfasts served daily. 3,557

2) a) Estimated average lunch cost (1974-75). . . 71.61¢
   b) Estimated average breakfast cost (1974-75). 37.95¢
   c) Average lunch cost (1973-74). . . . . 65.10¢
   d) Average breakfast cost (1973-74). . . . . 34.50¢

3) a) Student lunch prices have increased over last year by about 03-cents a lunch on a statewide average.
   b) The breakfast program is rather insignificant; the state average price increase was 01-cent.
   c) On a statewide basis, the number of paying students in October, 1974 was .30 per cent less than in October, 1973. The decrease may have been caused by the increase in the number of free and reduced price lunches.

4) a) Reduced price lunches served daily. 3,018
   b) Reduced price breakfasts served daily . . . 54
   c) Reduced price lunches served daily (Oct., '73) 532
   d) Reduced price breakfasts served daily (Oct.,'73) 20

5) The expanded reduced price program from 150% to 175% has not produced any significant change in reduced meal participation. The number of school districts offering the reduced price meal has almost doubled this year. 61 public districts (about 15%) are now participating in the reduced price programs; last year 34 offered reduced price meals to the students.

126 Langdon Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53702

6) Students not eligible for free or reduced price meals will participate when the established charge is about the same as the food cost for the meal served. I believe we need legislation that would establish a maximum meal charge based on the school's average per meal food cost and which would authorize general cash assistance funds to offset local district costs beyond the average per meal food costs. The escalation of meal costs and the attitude of most school authorities to operate a "break even" program will eventually reduce the Child Nutrition Programs to welfare programs if present pricing and funding formulas continue.

7) Breakfast programs are not expanding in Wisconsin for all of the reasons noted. However, I believe that administrative problems and school food personnel overload are the two main reasons for the lag. Certainly the "this is the family job" response is evident but it often appears to be a cover-up for the other reasons given.

8) One could quickly respond by saying that increased funding would help but participation is not as high as expected in the "especially needy" school breakfast programs. Also, in the larger city schools, many administrative problems must be overcome. It would involve negotiating with as many as five unions in some school districts to change the working times and duties to implement a breakfast program. I don't believe the problem can be solved by legislative changes short of mandating the breakfast program and fully funding it which I am not recommending.

9) The Type A pattern should be retained in the elementary levels, but a nutrient standard type of a meal pattern should be offered in the secondary levels. The nutrient standards would allow greater flexibility in menu design to reflect student preference and eating habits. If students do not acquire a taste for a particular food item by the time they are in the junior or senior class levels, it is generally recognized that they will not be accepted so why continue to provide such items. We experience little waste in the breakfast programs.

10) A) Wisconsin schools are doing some bid purchasing of foods on a regional basis. I don't believe there would be an economic loss to the schools if cash was provided in lieu of commodities. Furthermore, schools could buy what they really wanted to satisfy their particular student tastes. Schools now buy 80% of their food needs. The emphasis should be on better purchasing practices and procedures. The State Agency Food Service Bureau employs

a School Food Procurement Consultant to provide this service to the schools.

It should be noted, too, that the uncertainty of the Commodity Program causes many problems. It becomes more difficult to maintain an efficient and economic distribution system when kinds and amounts of food fluctuate. It becomes most difficult to distribute foods and to utilize foods advantageously when the users are numerous and small, such as is the situation with the growing numbers of institutions.

It is a real problem to the State Agency consultants to make kitchen facility and delivery system recommendations. Wisconsin had about 90% of the participating schools baking bread and/or rolls. The flour and shortening cutback is causing many to reduce or discontinue their baking programs. Should we be recommending baking equipment and floor space in new kitchen plans that school districts are presently building? Schools purchasing prepared meals from industry cannot utilize the commodities effectively. And while some processing contracts have reportedly generated savings, we cannot overlook the State Agency cost to implement and monitor these programs. No, I don't want the Commodity Program to continue. I would prefer the cash for the Wisconsin schools.

B) Yes it is. As I indicated in (A) above, most schools need help in purchasing. It is better to emphasize savings on the 80% of food purchase that the local schools must do. Presently schools can buy ground beef cheaper locally than that purchased by the USDA. Also, flour and other items when the per pound instate delivery cost is added to the government purchase price.

11) Wisconsin has a greater need to update and help schools maintain their program operation than to provide for new programs. We should have about $200,000 for new schools and $500,000 for ongoing program schools. We expect to receive $264,727 reserved funds and $237,051 unreserved funds.

12) There is no doubt that participation would increase by 75%. I would favor such a program but would prefer a universal lunch program and eliminate all the other school food service programs, including the Special Milk Program. The 10¢ program would require about $70 M additional monies for the state of Wisconsin.

13) The State matching and education aids payments of approximately $2.5 M would be eliminated. I can't estimate the local educational agency cost reduction if certification and reporting paper work was reduced by the provision of a universal lunch program. No doubt it would be substantial. It would have little fiscal impact on the State Agency in that regard.

14) A) None
B) All
C) None
D) Less than 10%

15) Up to 20-cents per lunch served free or at a reduced price to help defray production costs that exceed the available federal reimbursements. None for breakfasts. No increase in reimbursement rates in past three years. $1,321,464 was appropriated directly through State Aid this year. Schools will receive additional aids through the general education aids to defray approximately 40%, on the average, of the program operating losses experienced during the year.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. POST, DIRECTOR
Bureau for School Food Services

EJP:krt

THE STATE OF WYOMING
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE OFFICE BUILDING WEST
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

January 30, 1975

ROBERT G. SCHRADER
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

Senator George McGovern, Chairman
U. S. Senate Select Committee on
Nutrition and Human Needs
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

RE: Telegram dated January 23, 1975

Dear Senator McGovern:

I certainly appreciate the opportunity to reply to the following questions concerning Child Nutrition Programs. I feel that it is most important for the state agencies who are intimately involved with the local school food service programs to be able to provide information to your committee in order for needed revisions in legislation to be made concerning the Child Nutrition Programs.

The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. How many paid for and free lunches, on the average, are served in your state each day? Breakfast? (Use data from the latest available month.)

Lunches per day (September through November, 1974)

PUBLIC SCHOOLS		PRIVATE SCHOOLS	
Paid	Free	Paid	Free
32,896	5,557	770	289

Breakfasts per day (September through November, 1974)

PUBLIC SCHOOLS		PRIVATE SCHOOLS	
Paid	Free	Paid	Free
32	360	9	119

2. What do you estimate is the average cost in your state of producing a lunch this year? A Breakfast? How does this compare to last year?

PUBLIC SCHOOLS Average annual cost per lunch through November 1974, is 69¢ compared to an average annual cost of 65¢ for the 73-74 school year.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS Average annual cost of 57¢ last year compared to an average annual cost of 57¢ this year through November, 1974.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS-BREAKFAST Average cost per breakfast 63¢ through December, 1974, compared to an average annual average cost of 62¢ for last school year.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS-BRFAKFAST Average cost per breakfast 47¢ through December, 1974 compared to an average annual cost of 40¢ per breakfast last school year.

3. Has the student's price increased per lunch over last year? Per breakfast? How much, on the average, is the increase for each? Can you correlate loss of participation among paying students, if any, with this increase? If so, what is it?

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Price per lunch last year 45-55¢. Price per lunch this year 50-60¢. Price per breakfast last year 35¢. Price per breakfast this year 40¢.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Price per lunch last year 30¢. Price per lunch this year 35¢. Price per breakfast last year 20¢. Price per breakfast this year 20¢.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Participation is up this year 39,170 lunches per day to date compared to 38,281 lunches per day for last year.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

1,047 lunches per day last year compared to 1,070 lunches per day this year.

4. How many reduced price lunches are served each day? Breakfast? How do these figures compare with last year at this time?

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	Reduced Price Lunches Per Day	Reduced Price Breakfasts Per Day
This Year	716	9
Last Year	497	8

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

	Reduced Price Lunches Per Day	Reduced Price Breakfasts Per Day
This Year	3	0
Last Year	4	0

5. What has been the effect of the expanded reduced price program on participation in your state? How many school districts have initiated reduced price lunches this year?

Since our total participation (public and private) is up 2.27% and our reduced price lunches are up 30.11% this year, we can assume that the expanded reduced price program has helped expand the program to those children in need of a reduced price lunch.

Note: A factor that should be considered is that Wyoming is experiencing an approximate 2% annual growth rate in school enrollment.

We have had eight additional districts initiate the reduced price program this year.

6. What legislative changes, if any, would you recommend to help stop the loss of paying students in the lunch program?

We would suggest increased reimburrement rates under Section 4 for all Type A lunches in order to defray the cost of lunches and therefore enable the districts to reduce the price to paying children.

7. The School Breakfast Program has not expanded at the same rate as the Lunch Program. Why has program participation lagged? Funding? Administrative Problems? Lack of Public Information? School Food Personnel Overloaded? The "This is the family job" attitude?

The School Breakfast Program has lagged due to apathy by children and parents - no interest in participation on their part.

8. What changes, if any, in the legislation would help improve the participation rate and quality of the breakfast program?

We have no suggestions on legislative changes for the Breakfast Program.

9. What, if any, modification in the meal pattern should be made to help increase participation and decrease waste in the lunch program? The Breakfast Program?

The following comment does not pertain to meal patterns. Make funds available for school lunch room improvements (appearance). Decrease the institutionalized atmosphere of the cafeterias by allowing school districts to use Non-Reserved Funds for changes in building structure and painting, etc.

10. (a) If the commodity program were to end how much cash per meal would you need to offset the loss? Do you want the commodity program to continue? If so, how would you improve it or change it? (b) In your opinion, is it possible for schools to purchase from the local wholesalers certain food items such as frozen

meats and canned fruits and vegetables as cheaply as USDA is able to buy them, assuming equal quality? If not, please give an example of the cost differential for one item.

(a) Approximately 10¢ per meal is needed to offset the loss at present, but will continue to increase due to inflation. This factor would require an escalator clause.

Comments from schools suggest that they would rather continue on the present commodity program then receive cash.

Ship more than one item per shipment to save transportation costs. Insure that a variety of commodities are available.

Buy foods early in the school year and distribute during the year and do not purchase late in the school year as the commodities will sit in the school's storage facilities over the summer months.

Try new food items (e.g. peanut granules-children really like them.) Maybe pizza prepared sauce and dough.

(b) It is not possible to locally purchase these goods as cheaply as USDA. Example: School districts pay approximately 89¢ per pound for hamburger compared to USDA purchase of hamburger at 63¢ per pound.

11. What are your equipment needs for new programs? For existing programs? How much do you expect to receive for each of these this year?

Our need for equipment for new programs is not overly great but an increase in funding is needed. The need for reserved funds is continually increasing due to impacted areas in the State of Wyoming because of increased industrial activity. This impact is resulting in construction of many new schools to serve the personnel building the coal generating electrical plants. Our needs for existing programs are great and we will not be able to assist all those schools in need of assistance this fiscal year. Due to inflation eating away at school districts' budgets, the schools do not have sufficient funds to maintain their cafeterias.

Our allocation for new programs is $24,238 for fiscal year 1975.

Our allocation for existing programs is $24,335 for fiscal year 1975.

We need to receive more assistance for existing programs and reserved funds for the drastic impact on the schools in Wyoming.

12. What percent increase in participation would you expect in your state if the School Lunch Program were to be made universal, at 10¢ per lunch for all students? Under such a program, it is assumed that the need for totally free lunches would be minimal. Would you favor such a program? Can you estimate the additional monies needed to have such a program in your state?

We would estimate a 50% increase in participation if a universal program were to go into effect with the child paying 10¢ per meal. We would definitely favor such a program. We would estimate $10,068,300 would be needed in order to reimburse the schools for meals served assuming that a meal would cost 70¢ per meal, the child would pay 10¢ of this cost and a 50% increase in participation.

13. How much time and money would your state save if a universal program were to replace the current program, and its current certification and reporting paperwork was reduced accordingly?

I would guess it would be in excess of $50,000 state-wide.

14. What percent of the schools districts in your state charge the lunch program for the cost of: (a) utilities, (b) transportation of USDA foods, (c) school administrative overhead, (d) employment of personnel for supervision during this school period?

(a) At the present time, districts in Wyoming do not charge the lunch program for utilities, however, we are implementing a new food service accounting system that will charge all lunch programs in the state for their applicable utility cost. (b) All districts charge the lunch program for the cost of transporting USDA commodities, (c) At the present time, districts do not charge the School Lunch Program for school administrative overhead. As stated above, with the new accounting system in the future all school lunch programs will charge the lunch program with school administrative costs; (d) At the present time, districts do not charge the lunch program for employment of personnel for supervision during the lunch period. As stated in (a) above, with the new accounting system this charge will be made to the food service in the future.

15. What, if any, are the current levels of state reimbursement you receive for lunches this year? Breakfast? How much has this increased in the last three years? What is the total amount of state money you currently receive?

No state appropriated funds are used to reimburse for lunches and breakfasts served. We use the State Foundation Program as state match for Section 4 funds. Total state funds available for administration of the state office currently is $67,475 (two year period of time).

If additional information is needed, please do not hesitate to contact this office. We will be more than happy to furnish additional needed information.

Sincerely,

Sidney C. Werner

Sidney C. Werner
State Director
Child Nutrition Programs

SCW/BKK/sb

50-215 O - 73 -- 11

GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA
PAGO PAGO, AMERICAN SAMOA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

February 6, 1975

George Mc.Govern
Chairman, U.S. Senate
Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs.

Following informations are in reference to your telegram dated, January 23, 1975.

1. 8,400 lunches served free
2. 5,600 free breakfast served

	'74	-	'75
2. Average cost per lunch	.26	-	31.25
Average cost per breakfast	.08	-	.11

3. N.A.
4. N.A.
5. N.A.
6. None, All students in American Samoa are served with lunches and breakfast.
7. Lack of facilities
8. No changes
9. None
10. We don't have any Market or Wholesalers to purchase Commodities in American Samoa. But we prefer to continue receiving commodities for our program.
11. Equipments needs: Electric ranges, refrigerators, freezers - $10,000 for one year.
12. American Samoa are feeding 100% free lunches and breakfast to students.
13. This will only an estimate of 15% of time and money save if this is replaced from the universal program.
14. None
15. None applied.

LUTEA M. TUA'OLO
FOOD SERVICE MANAGER

SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY

Increase in price of meals to students, 1973–74 to 1974–75:

Lunch (38 replies):

No increase: 6 States.
Less than 5 cents: 4 States.
5 cents: 19 States.
6–9 cents: 3 States.
10 cents: 4 States.
More than 10 cents: 1 State.
No paid meals: 1 State.

Breakfast (33 replies):

No increase: 10 States.
Less than 5 cents: 8 States.
5 cents: 12 States.
6–9 cents: 1 State.
10 cents: 1 State.
More than 10 cents: No State.
No paid meals: 1 State.

Average cost of producing meals, increase 1973–74 to 1974–75:

Lunch:

1973–74 (32 replies): 68 cents.
1974–75 (37 replies): 76.5 cents.
Increase: 13 percent.

Breakfast:

1973–74 (32 replies): 32.7 cents.
1974–75 (37 replies): 38 cents.
Increase: 13 percent.

State support per meal above required matching (31 replies):

None: 7 States.
Less than 1 cent: 2 States.
1–1.99 cents: 8 States.
2–2.99 cents: 3 States.
3–3.99 cents: No State.
4–4.99 cents: No State.
5–5.99 cents: 2 States.
6–6.99 cents: 2 States.
7–7.99 cents: 1 State.
8–8.99 cents: No State.
9–9.99 cents: 1 State.
10 cents and more: 2 States.
For free and reduced price meals only: 3 States.

Equipment needs:

For new programs (32 replies): $11,192,000.
For existing programs (32 replies): $22,324,000.

NUMBER OF LUNCHES SERVED PER DAY[1]

Lunches:	Paid (35 replies)	Reduced price (36 replies)	Free (35 replies)
	(Number of States)		
None	1	2	9
Less than 10,000	1	23	4
10,000 to 24,999	1	7	6
25,000 to 49,999	3	2	3
50,000 to 99,999	6	1	4
100,000 to 199,999	6	1	3
200,000 to 299,999	6	0	1
300,000 to 399,999	3	0	1
400,000 to 499,999	1	0	0
500,000 or more	3	0	1

[1] Some States reported all lunches; some only lunches served in public schools. When both were reported, the total of public and private is shown.

NUMBER OF BREAKFASTS SERVED PER DAY[1]

	Paid (33 replies)	Reduced price (35 replies)	Free (33 replies)
Breakfasts:	(Number of States)		
None	1	3	0
Less than 500	5	21	2
500 to 999	4	7	3
1,000 to 1,999	3	1	4
2,000 to 2,999	1	0	0
3,000 to 3,999	6	0	4
4,000 to 4,999	6	1	1
5,000 to 9,999	4	1	2
10,000 to 14,999	2	1	2
15,000 to 19,999	0	0	3
20,000 or over	1	0	12

[1] Some States reported all lunches; some only lunches served in public schools. When both were reported, the total of public and private is shown.

INCREASE IN PARTICIPATION IN REDUCED PRICE MEALS FROM SCHOOLYEAR 1973–74 TO SCHOOLYEAR 1974–75

	Lunch (32 replies)	Breakfast (30 replies)
Increase:	(Number of States)	
Less than 100	2	10
100 to 299	1	3
300 to 499	0	7
500 to 699	0	2
700 to 999	1	0
1,000 to 2,999	11	4
3,000 to 4,999	1	0
5,000 to 6,999	1	0
7,000 to 9,999	6	0
10,000 or more	5	0
Decrease	0	1
No reduced price meals	2	3

EFFECT OF ADMINISTRATION'S BLOC GRANT ON CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

[From Community Nutrition Institute Weekly Report, Vol. V, No. 6, Feb. 6, 1975]

Budget Message Proposes Ending Child Nutrition Programs

The Ford Administration ignited a new firestorm in the nutrition area this week by calling for the abolition of the school lunch, school breakfast, special milk, equipment assistance, day care, summer feeding, supplemental feeding, and women, infants, and children (WIC) programs.

The Administration said it would seek legislation designed to replace all existing child nutrition programs with a single program of block grants to states. The announcement came this week with the unveiling of President Ford's budget request for fiscal year 1976.

The block grants would provide $600 million to $700 million less in food assistance in fiscal 1976 than would the continuation of existing programs. The principal savings would result from termination of federal support for school meals served to non-poor children.

Pregnant and nursing women who now receive food supplements under the WIC and supplemental food programs would also be cut off entirely. Block grant funds would be available for the provision of meals to children only.

Block Grants Proposed

Under the Administration's proposal, states would be able to use block grant funds to provide meals meeting one-third of the U.S. Recommended Daily Allowances (RDAs) of basic nutrients to children from families with incomes up to 125 percent of the poverty line. The children could receive their meals in schools, day care centers, summer recreation programs or other institutional settings.

The proposal would knock out about $650 million a year in federal support currently provided to schools to help defray the costs of breakfasts, lunches and milk served to children from families above 125 percent of the poverty line. William G. Boling, manager of USDA's child nutrition division, predicted that the prices charged for school lunches would rise about 22 cents if the block grant concept goes into effect.

State allocations under the new proposal would be determined by multiplying $202 (90 cents per meal times 225 days) by the number of children in the state who are between the ages of one and 17 in families below the poverty line. Part of a state's allocation would be withheld, however, if the state had poor children in schools with no school food programs. The funds would be released only if the state used them to establish food programs in these schools.

The proposal is sure to meet vigorous and probably insurmountable opposition in Congress. It would require families of four with incomes above $5,640 a year to pay an average of 65 to 70 cents for each child. This aspect of the program will be difficult to sell on Capitol Hill.

In addition, an increase of 20 cents or more in the price of school lunches would drive several million paying children out of the program. The Senate Nutrition Committee estimated in a 1973 report that each increase of one cent in the price of school lunches causes one percent of the paying students (or about 145,000 children) to drop out of the program.

(continued on next page)

Congress Votes Freeze

The House on Tuesday voted 374-38 to freeze food stamp prices at current levels until the end of 1975. The Senate was expected to follow suit on Wednesday. For further details, see story on page 3.

If the number of children purchasing lunches declines sharply, per-lunch preparation costs will rise, necessitating possible further increases in meal prices and further dislocations in the program.

Organizations and agencies involved with non-school food programs also are likely to oppose the Administration proposal. Day care and summer feeding programs would have no assurance of receiving funds from state officials who would control the block grants, and WIC directors would see their new programs dissipated almost entirely.

The proposal has already drawn a bitter blast from Senator George S. McGovern (D-S.D.), Nutrition Committee chairman, who declared within hours after release of the budget message that he was totally and implacably opposed to the block grants proposal.

"I am certain Congress will not allow 30 years of progress in the health and welfare of our children to be destroyed because of misguided values," McGovern declared.

USDA administrators have little optimism about their proposal's chances in Congress. At a press briefing on the budget request last Saturday, USDA budget director Jerome Miles noted wryly: "There are some who think this won't pass."

Elimination of Programs

Even if the block grant proposal is defeated, however, the Ford Administration will seek to terminate the school breakfast, summer feeding, day care, WIC, supplemental feeding and special milk programs. Legislation governing all these programs except supplemental feeding and special milk expires June 30, and the Administration announced this week it will not seek to have these programs renewed.

In addition, while authority for the supplemental and milk programs does continue beyond June 30, the Administration is requesting no money whatsoever for these programs, whether or not a block grant proposal is enacted. Only the school lunch program, equipment assistance for schools, and

Food Assistance Programs - Fiscal Years 1974-1976

(Program Level - Dollars in Millions)

Program	1974 Actual	1975 Estimate	1976 Under Existing Legislation	1976 Under Proposed Legislation
CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS:				
1. Cash Grants to States:				
(a) School Lunch (Section 4)	$ 412.1	$ 444.4	$ 498.0	
(b) Free & Reduced Price Lunches	651.2	751.1	865.0	
(c) School Breakfast	80.7	74.1	--------a/	
(d) Nonfood Assistance	20.1	26.0	28.0	
(e) State Administrative Expenses	5.7	6.2	6.7	
(f) Nonschool Food Programs	70.4	116.5b/	--------a/	
(g) Grants in lieu of Commodities	--------	--------	73.0	
2. Commodities to States	347.8	381.0	365.2	
3. Nutrition Training and Survey and Operating Expenses	8.4	11.1	14.4	1,682.5c/
SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM	93.1	120.0	--------a/	
SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM	15.3	127.1	--------a/	
TOTAL	$1,695.0	$2,059.7	$1,850.3	$1,682.5c/
FOOD STAMP PROGRAM	4,864.0	5,701.0	5,850.0	5,641.6d/
DIRECT DISTRIBUTION TO FAMILIES	193.7	42.5e/	2.8e/	2.8e/
DIRECT DISTRIBUTION TO INSTITUTIONS	19.8	22.3	--------	--------
FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAM	--------	--------	5.8e/	5.8e/
ELDERLY FEEDING	--------	5.6	6.0	6.0
SECTION 32 OPERATING EXPENSES (AMS & FNS)	6.8	7.2	6.7	6.5
NUTRITION EDUCATION (Extension Service excluding Administrative Expenses)	47.4	47.4	47.4	47.4
TOTAL FOOD ASSISTANCE	$4,825.3	$5,867.3	$5,777.0	$5,789.6

a. Includes $84 million for day care feeding and $32.7 million for summer feeding.
b. Includes $6.4 million for supplemental feeding.
c. Both the $2.8 million under "Direct Distribution to Families" and the $5.8 million under "Food Donations Program" are for commodity distribution to needy families on Indian reservations.
d. USDA is proposing to substitute a comprehensive block grant program for the present child nutrition programs, special milk, special supplemental food (WIC), and commodity supplemental food programs. $1,682.5 million is being requested for the block grant program in FY 1976.
e. USDA is proposing to limit cost-of-food adjustments in all food programs to 5 percent over the 18 month period from January 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976. This proposal would reduce food stamp expenditures by $217.3 million to a total of $5,641.6 million.

Child Nutrition...

commodities for schools would be allowed to continue into fiscal 1976, under the USDA budget request, if the block grants are not implemented.

The Administration is also proposing to terminate all commodity deliveries to orphanges, children's homes, homes for the aged, and other institutions. These institutions are receiving $22.3 million in commodities during the current fiscal year.

A background paper on the budget prepared by the budget division of USDA's Food and Nutrition Service notes that the "general theme" of the fiscal 1976 budget for food programs is "the need to reduce federal spending." The paper also observes that USDA is assuming no growth in participation in the food programs. "In fact, declines are expected to result from tighter administration," the paper declares.

Five Percent "Cap"

In addition to a wholesale dismantling of the child nutrition programs, the Administration is asking for new legislation to limit cost-of-food adjustments in all federal food programs to 5 percent over the 18-month period from July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976, even though food costs may rise 20 percent or more during this period (see CNI Vol. V:5).

Food stamp households would be especially hard hit by this proposal. USDA officials say that the food stamp allotment for a family of four, currently set at $154 a month, would be allowed to rise only to $158 a month on July 1, 1975 and would not be permitted to increase at all on January 1, 1976, if the 5 percent limit is enacted.

Without the limit, the food stamp allotment for a family of four is expected to rise to $164 this July and to $172 next January 1, according to USDA.

The 5 percent limit would also hit school food programs -- if these were allowed to continue instead of the block grant. School food reimbursements already rose more than 5 percent on January 1 of this year. Consequently, there would be no increase at all in reimbursements again for 18 months -- until July 1, 1976.

The reduction in food stamp allotments and school food reimbursements would be permanent rather than for a one-year period, because the percentage increase that would be allowed in July 1976 would cover only the preceding six months rather than the entire 18-month period. There would be no "catch-up" to bring food stamp allotments and school food reimbursement rates up to the levels they would otherwise have attained during this period.

This means that food stamp allotments would remain permanently nearly 10 percent below the cost of the economy food plan, the cheapest food plan calculated by USDA. The Department's own studies show that over half the families spending at the full cost level of the economy plan still have poor diets and that only one out of ten families spending at this level gets 100 percent of the RDAs for the seven most basic nutrients.

Commodity donations to schools and elderly feeding programs would also be limited to a 5 percent increase. The donations, which currently total 10 cents per meal, would be limited to 10.5 cents per meal in fiscal 1976. Similarly, reimbursements in the special milk program would rise to only 5.25 cents per half pint of milk next year (if the special milk program is continued).

Commodity Programs

In the area of commodity programs, the new budget shows that the Ford Administration, like the Nixon Administration before it, wishes these programs would largely disappear. The budget contains no money at all for the provision of commodities to institutions. In addition, the donation of commodies to schools and other child nutrition programs would be ended by the block grant proposal.

USDA officials said that commodities could still be made available for schools from time to time, but the commodities would have to be paid for with the state's block grant money. (The budget does show that if the block grant proposal and the 5 percent ceiling are both rejected by Congress, USDA expects to provide about 9.38 cents in commodities and about 1.87 cents cash in lieu of commodities for each school lunch served in fiscal 1976.)

USDA also plans to provide $8.6 million in commodities for Indian reservations still distributing commodities to needy families and $6 million in commodities to nutrition projects for the elderly. However, the elderly feeding commodities would be composed entirely of food items that are in surplus. USDA's authority to purchase non-surplus commodities at market prices for school food and elderly feeding programs expires June 30, and the Department will not seek to have this authority renewed. The selection of commodities available to elderly feeding programs in fiscal 1976 could be extremely limited as a result.

The budget also shows that USDA plans to spend only $28 million on equipment assistance for schools in fiscal 1976 if the block grant proposal

is not accepted. The $28 million figure is the same amount spent on this program in fiscal years 1974 and 1975, representing somewhat of a decline in real support for this program when inflation is taken into account. A USDA survey released last March showed school districts reporting a need for $177 million in equipment aid.

Summer Feeding Affected

While Congress is likely to reject the Administration's legislative recommendations in most child nutrition areas, one program -- summer feeding -- could still suffer substantial damage in the coming months. Proposed regulations for the summer feeding program generally come out in February, and handbooks and application forms usually follow in March. This year, however, USDA will apparently issue no regulations or handbooks because it is seeking to abolish the program.

If summer feeding sponsors are forced to wait for enactment of new legislation extending the program, they may find themselves unable to begin any preparation for this year's program until the summer is almost upon them. The result would be administrative chaos and a program that reaches only a small number of children.

Another program whose future now appears uncertain is the women, infants, and children (WIC) feeding program. Congress is unlikely to adhere to USDA's request to let this program expire on June 30, and the WIC program probably will be extended. But what level of funding Congress will choose to provide for the WIC program is now unclear.

At present, USDA is required by legislation and by court order to spend about $125 million on the WIC program in fiscal 1975. In order to spend this amount, the Department has been awarding large numbers of new grants and allowing caseload increases during the course of the fiscal year. If all WIC projects that have now been funded were to operate at full capacity for a year, the cost of the program could run close to $200 million.

Since USDA can be expected to oppose any efforts to secure funding of this magnitude for WIC next year, a major battle over WIC funding could develop this spring.

Food Stamp Estimate

The budget message requests only $3.86 billion for the food stamp program in fiscal 1976, but this estimate was based on the mistaken assumption that Congress would allow the Administration to raise the price of food stamps on March 1. If Congress succeeds in blocking the food stamp price increase, the projected cost of the program in fiscal 1976 will rise to nearly $4.8 billion.

DOCUMENTS AND LETTERS FROM CONCERNED GROUPS AND CITIZENS

COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS

ROBERT MOORE, CHAIRMAN
DONALD McCALLUM, VICE CHAIRMAN
DONALD Q. KIRKLAND
RAYMOND LUKE
DIXIE N. MORGAN, M.D.

Coffee County Schools

CHARLES C. MORGAN, JR., SUPERINTENDENT
P. O. BOX 939
Douglas, Georgia 31533

MR. WENDELL TANNER
Curriculum Director
MR. L. J. HARRELL
Visiting Teacher
MR. CHESTER WILLIAMS
Director of Guidance
MRS. CARROLL McNEILL
Communication Coordinator
MRS. JACK J. TAYLOR
Bookkeeper
MRS. CHARLES ROBERTS
Secretary
MRS. DANNY W. COURSON
Secretary
MRS. TOMMY SWAILS
Secretary
MRS. KARL K. DOCKERY
Lunchroom Supervisor
WALTER S. RAY, JR.
Federal Programs

February 13, 1975

Senator George McGovern
United State Senate
Washington D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. McGovern:

I have read with interest and regret that Georgia Schools may lose between thirteen and fifteen million dollars in federal funds for school lunch programs.

A well fed child is content, and a content child is able to respond to stimulation and learn. We feel our lunchroom program provides nutritional foods for our school children. If it were not for our school lunches, special milk programs, commodities and the other programs that are financed through these funds our children would not be afforded these nutritional opportunities. This would lead to the sale of snacks and empty-calorie food.

The middle class family would suffer most from this cut back in funds. With the commodity program and the other financial assistance which we are presently receiving, our middle class families could afford our present charge for lunches; however, we feel that a universal lunch for every child is the answer to a good nutritional program. Due to the present economic conditions in our community, our middle class families are finding it more difficult to afford school lunches.

May we appeal to you to exert every effort to maintain these funds for our lunch programs.

Sincerely yours,

Charles C. Morgan, Jr.
County School Superintendent

Mirtie S. Dockery
Lunchroom Supervisor

CCM/sc

Carver
DAY CARE CENTER

LINDA K. JONES
Director

2/19/75

Mr. Alan Stone
Senate Nutrition Committee
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Sir,

The Carver Day Care Center is re-imbursed annually at a rate of about $5,000 for monies spent on food. It is our understanding that all future funding for that re-imbursement program has been neglected in the President's budget, effective June 30, 1975.

We provide daily care for 35 children of working parents, or parents who are enrolled in vocational training programs. Through the re-imbursement program (United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, via Child Nutrition Program) we are able to serve our children breakfast, lunch, and two supplements daily. The children are receiving the nutritional basics daily. Our budget has been submitted and approved for 1975, we do not have $5,000 to spend on food.

Please do all you can as soon as possible to revive the funding for this essential program for poverty and low income children.

Thank you.

Joseph L. Allen

Carver Community Center
Board of Directors

700 CRAIG STREET • SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK 12307 • TELEPHONE 374-8456

FOUNDED 1865

The Salvation Army

(INCORPORATED)

CHILD DEVELOPMENT DAY CARE CENTER
20-22 CLINTON AVENUE
ALBANY, N. Y. 12207
TELEPHONE 463-6678

February 19, 1975

Senator George McGovern
Senate Office Buildings
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

The Special Food Program for Children is to expire on June 30, 1975. Our Day Care Center is funded for food, by this program, and we have no other source of money for food for the children.

Since nutrition is perhaps the most basic component of Day Care for 3-5 year olds, it is unconciable to think that a program to feed American children will be terminated. Life depends on food, and it is not unrealistic to say that childrens lives might be terminated, as a result of this.

Our program serves breakfast, lunch and two snacks in a long day 7:30 - 5:30. For many families, the children's food requirements are met at the Day Center, a saving of needed money in the home budget, for the parents of our children.

I am fearful of the effects of no food money for Day Center Children and I ask your continued support to extend the life of the program.

If you have any suggestions that we could carry out, parent letters, parent signatures, or even participation in committee hearings, we would be glad to help.

Very truly yours,

M. Jane Ritz, Dir.

cp

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY OF WEST HAVEN
CONNECTICUT

ROBERT A. JOHNSON
MAYOR

February 28, 1975

The Honorable Senator George McGovern
Chairman
U.S. Senate Select Committee on
Nutrition & Human Needs
Old Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

It was with some alarm that I learned that the United States Department of Agriculture will be terminating four very important food (nutrition?) programs. They are the Special Food Service Program, Special Milk Program, School Breakfast Program, and the Woman, Infant and Child Supplemental Program.

How anyone could possibly conceive of such an idea with the times being what they are is almost unbelievable. The unemployment rate for the City of West Haven is presently 8.4%. Lord knows at what point it will level off, never mind drop. If this alone is not reason enough to continue these food programs, I cannot think of greater justification at this time. I do know, however, that these food programs certainly insure our children some measure of nutritional benefit.

A large number of West Haven children receive lunches at reduced prices during the school year. We wish to follow through, as we did last year, by providing a summer feeding program. In the summer of 1974 we serviced children with our lunch program each day. This summer, because so many people are out of work, we feel there will be a greater need to extend lunch benefits to more children. To lose such an invaluable service in our city would have dire consequences for the health of our children.

I strongly urge your support for the continuation of these food programs at least at current levels of funding after June 30, 1975 by Continuing Resolutions of Congress pending enactment of new legislation with adequate appropriations.

In behalf of the citizens of West Haven, I thank you and rely on your continued support.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Johnson
MAYOR

RAJ/mam
cc:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR EDUCATION & TRAINING
SUITE 102 UNIVERSITIES CENTER
3825 RIDGEWOOD ROAD
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39211

WILLIAM LOWE WALLER
GOVERNOR

DR. MILTON BAXTER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

March 6, 1975

Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Senate Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern:

The Mississippi Child Development Council views with grave concern the cut in the child nutrition budget. The elimination of the Nonschool Food Program will affect adversely thousands of eligible preschoolers in day care and Headstart centers across Mississippi. The children, many severely malnourished, have been receiving well-balanced meals in centers whose budgets will not allow adequate feeding without assistance with rising food costs.

The rapid physical and intellectual growth of the preschool child is more easily damaged by malnutrition than is the case with the older child in school.

We earnestly request your support for keeping the Nonschool Food Program going, in behalf of our many young children who cannot speak in their own behalf, but who will bear the marks of early poor nutrition for the rest of their lives.

Sincerely,

Reba Southwell

Reba Southwell, Ed. D.
Chairman, State Child Development Council

RS:vb

CITY OF HARTFORD

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

550 MAIN STREET

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

March 10, 1975

Clerk
Robert J. Gallivan

Councilmen
Richard M. Bieluch
Nicholas R. Carbone
John J. Cavaliere, Jr.
William V. DeBella
Mary M. Hayden
George Lewis
Albert A. Marcin
Richard Newman
Margaret S. Tedone

This is to certify that at a meeting of the Court of Common Council, March 10, 1975, the following RESOLUTION was passed.

WHEREAS, The School Breakfast Program provides the day's most important meal to youngsters who would otherwise lack this vital nourishment; and

WHEREAS, President Ford's proposed 1975-76 budget provides for elimination of the School Breakfast Program; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Hartford Court of Common Council does hereby go on record as rejecting the Ford Administration's elimination of the School Breakfast Program and urges that the program be continued at least at current funding levels after June 30, 1975, by continuing Congressional resolution(s),pending the enactment of new legislation, with adequate appropriations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Town Clerk is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to President Ford, the Connecticut Congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., Senators George McGovern and Hubert Humphrey, Congressmen Charles A. Vanik and Carl Perkins, Dr. Richard Felter, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Mr. William G. Boling, Director, Child Nutrition Division, Food Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Attest:

Robert J. Gallivan,
City Clerk.

50-718 O - 75 -- 12

CITY OF HARTFORD

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

550 MAIN STREET

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

Councilmen
Richard M. Brown
Nicholas R. Carbone
John J. Gannon, Jr.
William A. DeRitz
Marc M. Heslin
George Lyons
Alice A. Marion
Richard Sisitzky
Margaret V. Tedone

Clerk
Robert J. Gallivan

March 10, 1975

This is to certify that at a meeting of the Court of Common Council, March 10, 1975, the following RESOLUTION was passed.

WHEREAS, The Special Food Services Program for Children provides essential year-round day care and summer feeding services to children who might otherwise be denied vital care and nourishment; and

WHEREAS, President Ford's proposed 1975-76 budget provides for elimination of the Special Food Services Program for Children; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Hartford Court of Common Council does hereby go on record as rejecting the Ford Administration's elimination of the Special Food Service Program for Children (year-round and summer feeding) and urges that programs be continued at least at current funding levels after June 30, 1975, by continuing Congressional resolution(s), pending the enactment of new legislation, with adequate appropriations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Town Clerk is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to President Ford, the Connecticut Congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., Senators George McGovern and Hubert Humphrey, Congressmen Charles A. Vanik and Carl Perkins, Dr. Richard Felter, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Mr. William G. Boling, Director, Child Nutritution Division, Food Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Attest:

Robert J. Gallivan,
City Clerk.

CEDARBURG PUBLIC SCHOOLS

[redacted]
CEDARBURG, WISCONSIN [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted]
[redacted]

March 10, 1975

Senator George McGovern
362 Old Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGovern;

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed budget cuts in funding for School Lunch Programs. As a Food Service Director for a small school district, I forsee the total elimination of this and many similar programs.

Cedarburg, like many other upper income communities, has relatively few free lunch participants. By forcing me to increase the price of child's lunch to 70¢(a very conservative estimate) President Ford would be condemming this program to extinction. Participation will be cut by 1/2 to 1/3 the present level and our few needy children will no longer be kept anonymous.

The most disturbing aspect of this is the long-range nutritional implication that it could have. As long as good, nutritious food is inexpensive, children will eat wisely. If on the other hand, the cost of a glass of milk equals a soda, you can guess the choice the young person will make.

Please Senator McGovern, help us fight to continue School Lunch to all children--not just the needy. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Patrice K. Bostwick, R.D.

Patrice K. Bostwick, R.D.
Food Service Director
Cedarburg Public Schools

2032 10th Avenue
Yuma, Ariz. 85364

Senator George McGovern

Dear sir:

I have several grandchildren that eat lunch at school in Arizona and other states.

I know here, in Yuma, we would have lots of hungry children if we had no School Lunch Program.

So I hope you will vote NO on the proposal to repeal the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs.

Also, it would put thousands of school lunch people out of work.

Best regards,

Ruth Lewis

Yakima, Wash.
March 12, 1975

Honorable George McGovern

Dear Sir:

In his January 3 budget message to Congress, President Ford stated that legislation would repeal and supersede all existing child nutrition legislation. After 30 years of building a School Lunch Program to where it is at the present time, this would be one of the saddest mistakes of the future.

Why take this mess this country is in at present out on the children?

Many children in our area only get the one hot meal per day. Otherwise it's only junk food that they may get themselves because "mother sleeps in," "mother and daddy have to entertain friends," or money is not available to buy school lunches.

Please help u to feed these hungry children! I look into over 600 little faces daily and it's sure not the salary I receive for cooking this food ($2.82 per hr.) but the satisfaction of watching them enjoy a balanced, nutritional meal at least once a day.

This lunch program must not go down the drain.

Respectfully,

Mrs. E. P. Rines
4415 Terrace Dr.
Yakima, Wash. 98901

684 North Lincoln Dr.
Pasadena, Calif. 91103

March 13, 1975

The Honorable George McGovern
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Sir:

I disagree strongly with the decision to cutback the Head Start food budget. You are not the one to suffer from this decision, it is the children.

I have watched the learning progress of the children in my area and have watched the improvement that they have made. A main reason for this improvement is good nutrition.

Therefore, I strongly protest against any cutback in the Head Start food budget,

Sincerely,

Mrs. Gloria Wilson
Head Start parent

1140 N. 37th Street
Milwaukee, Wis. 53208

March 17, 1975

Senator George McGovern,

As a middle-class family and mother of eight children, I would like someone to try and do something about the ridiculous changes planned for the School Lunch Program. It is bad enough trying to feed them now, but at the new price for the garbage planned it is impossible and who would even pay for it!

We spend enough feeding other countries while our own people are going hungry. You can be sure none of those countries will come to our aid if needed.

It is time to dut down on some of that ridiculous government spending and, at least, help our children have some decent food.

Thank you,

Mrs. Ernst Spaltner

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE · 7060 HOPKINS ROAD, MENTOR, OHIO 44060
TELEPHONE · 216 · 255 · 4444

March 17, 1975

Senator George McGovern
U. S. Senate
1203 Dirksen Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Senator McGovern:

It would be appreciated if you would look into, with concern, President Ford's proposed legislation substituting a comprehensive bloc grant program for the present overlapping child feeding programs. My concern is that if this legislation were to be passed, school food service in fact, would be almost non-existent in many areas. I urge you to "NO" vote President Ford's proposed legislation for the following reasons:

1. Impact of the administration's proposed legislation is so far reaching that if passed, it would change the face of school food service completely.

2. School lunch prices would increase above the means of the middle class income. Starting prices 80 cents per meal and in many areas $1.00 per lunch.

3. Deprive a large number of children from the opportunity of receiving a hot nutritional meal in the middle of the day when it is mostly needed.

4. Nutrition standards would decline and consequently result in a rapid rise in malnutrition.

5. There would be no national criteria of any type for meals served to paying children and results would promote combinations of snacks and bad eating habits.

6. School food service personnel would be out of work and increase the country's unemployment rate.

7. A great reduction of dollars into the food industry.

8. The needy would be identified and reverse discrimination would occur.

I urge you to get behind the House Education and Labor Committee and the Committee on Nutritional and Human Needs to increase substantially the subsidies for the school lunch program so school children will not have to pay more than 25 cents for a lunch.

Your assistance in developing and supporting counteracting legislation to President Ford's proposal concerning this matter would be greatly appreciated by all of your constituents.

Sincerely,

Stanley J. Smith
Director of Food Service

SJS:mhk

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 513

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, Citing the South Dakota Legislature's concern over the proposal of the President of the United States to reduce the federal food subsidies' program to the school lunch program.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, THE SENATE CONCURRING THEREIN:

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States is considering a proposal made by the President of the United States to reduce the federal funds and food subsidies to the school lunch program by $600 million; and

WHEREAS, the federal funds and food subsidies received by the schools of the state of South Dakota are of primary importance in providing children with nutritious school lunches; and

WHEREAS, the President's proposed reduction of the school lunch program would result in an estimated twenty-four percent decrease in lunch program participation by needy children; and

WHEREAS, it has been recognized that a child's education and interest in school is enhanced by the serving of an adequate meal during the noon hours; and

WHEREAS, South Dakota has many rural students attending school at attendance centers many miles from home:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the House of Representatives of the Fiftieth Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the legislative assembly of the state of South Dakota petition the President of the United States to continue the federal school lunch program in its present form; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the South Dakota House of Representatives to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and to each member of the South Dakota Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by the House, March 13, 1975

Concurred in by the Senate March 18, 1975

Joe Barnett
Speaker of the House

Harvey Wollman
President of the Senate

Paul Inman
Chief Clerk of the House

Roger Pfunty
Secretary of the Senate

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Great Seal of the State of South Dakota at the city of Pierre, the Capital, on the 20 day of March, 1975

Lorna B. Herseth
Secretary of State
State of South Dakota

94TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 850

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 26 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 21), 1975

Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PHILIP A. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KENNEDY), introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts in order to extend and revise the special food service program for children, the special supplemental food program, and the school breakfast program, and for other purposes related to strengthening the school lunch and child nutrition programs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act Amendments of 1975".

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

SEC. 2. Section 4(a) of the Child Nutrition Act is amended by inserting after "and June 30, 1975," "and subsequent fiscal years".

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(c) As a national nutrition and health policy, it is the purpose and intent of the Congress that the school breakfast program be made available in all schools where it is needed to provide adequate nutrition for children in attendance. The Secretary is hereby directed, in cooperation with State educational agencies, to carry out a program of information to the schools in furtherance of this policy. Within ninety days after the enactment of this legislation, the Secretary shall report to the committee of jurisdiction in the Congress his plans and those of the cooperating State agencies, to bring about the needed expansion in the school breakfast program.".

MATCHING

SEC. 4. Section 7 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following sentence at the end of such section: "*Provided, however,* That the total State matching of $3 for $1, as required in the third sentence of this section with adjustments for the per capita income of the State, shall not apply with respect to the payments made to participating schools under section 4 of this Act for free and reduced price meals: *Provided further,* That the foregoing proviso does not apply in the case of State level matching as required under the sixth sentence of this section.".

INCOME GUIDELINES FOR REDUCED PRICE LUNCHES

SEC. 5. Section 9 (b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by deleting "75 per centum" in the last sentence of said section and substituting 100 per centum.".

NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 6. Section 10 of the National School Lunch Act is amended to read as follows: "If, in any State, the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this Act to nonprofit private schools in the State, or is not permitted by law to match Federal funds made available for use by such nonprofit private schools, the Secretary shall disburse the funds directly to the nonprofit private schools within said State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are authorized or required with respect to the disbursements to schools within the State by the State educational agency, including the requirement that any such payment or payments shall be matched, in the proportion specified in section 7 for such State, by funds from sources within the State expended by nonprofit private schools within the State participating in the school lunch program under this Act. Such funds shall not be considered a part of the funds constituting the matching funds under the terms of section 7: *Provided*, That beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the

Secretary shall make payments from the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for the purposes of section 4 of this Act directly to the nonprofit private schools in such State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are authorized or required under this Act with respect to the disbursements by the State educational agencies.".

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. Section 12 (d) (7) of the National School Lunch Act is amended to read as follows: "'School' means any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under and any public or licensed nonprofit private residential child caring institution, including, but not limited to orphanages, homes for the mentally retarded, homes for the emotionally disturbed, homes for unmarried mothers and their infants, temporary shelters for runaway children, temporary shelters for abused children, hospitals for children who are chronically ill, and juvenile detention centers.".

COMMODITIES

SEC. 8. Section 14 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1978" and by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(3) Among the products to be included in the food donations to the school lunch program shall be such

cereal and shortening and oil products as were provided in the fiscal year 1974. Such products shall be provided to the school lunch program in the same or greater quantities as were provided in the fiscal year 1974 and shall be in addition to the value of commodity donations, or cash in lieu thereof, as provided for in section 6 of this Act.".

SEC. 9. Section 6(c) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following language at the end of said section: "*Provided further*, That not less than 75 per centum of the assistance provided under this subsection shall be in the form of foods purchased by the United States Department of Agriculture for the school lunch program.".

SEC. 10. Section 6(a)(3) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following at the end of said section: "The value of assistance to children under this Act shall not be considered to be income or resources for any purposes under any Federal or State laws, including laws relating to taxation and welfare and public assistance programs.".

SEC. 11. Section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by deleting the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "For the purposes of this section 'United States' means the fifty States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.".

SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 12. Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by deleting subsection 13(g) and revising subsections 13(a), 13(b), and 13(c)(2) to read as follows:

"(a)(1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1976, and June 30, 1977, to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit food service programs for children in service institutions. For purposes of this section, the term 'service institutions' means public institutions or private, nonprofit institutions that develop special summer programs providing food service similar to that available to children under the national school lunch or school breakfast programs during the school year. To the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the purposes of this section, special summer programs shall utilize the existing food service facilities of public and nonprofit private schools. Any eligible institution shall receive the summer food program upon its request.

"(2) Service institutions eligible to participate under the program authorized under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act shall be limited to those which conduct a regularly scheduled program for children for areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there

are a high concentration of working mothers. Summer camps that otherwise qualify as institutions under this subsection shall be eligible for the summer food program if attending children are maintained in continuous residence for no more than one month.

"(b) The Secretary shall publish proposed regulations relating to the implementation of the summer food program by January 1 of each fiscal year, and shall publish final regulations, guidelines, applications, and handbooks by March 1 of each fiscal year.".

"(c) (2) In circumstances of severe need where the rate per meal established by the Secretary under subsection (c) (1) is insufficient to carry on an effective feeding program, the Secretary may authorize financial assistance not to exceed 80 per centum of the operating costs of such a program, including the cost of obtaining, preparing, and serving food. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to equipment and services. In the selection of institutions to receive assistance under this subsection, the State educational agency shall require the applicant institutions to provide justification of the need for such assistance. The maximum allowable reimbursement for service institutions authorized to receive assistance under this subsection shall be set at 80 cents for lunches and suppers served, 45 cents for break-

fasts served, and 25 cents for meal supplements served, with the above maximum amounts being adjusted each March 1 to the nearest one-fourth cent in accordance with changes for the twelve-month period ending the prior January 31 in the series for food away from home of the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. The initial such adjustment shall be made on March 1, 1976, and shall reflect the change in the series food away from home during the period January 31, 1975, to January 31, 1976.".

SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

SEC. 13. The National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 16. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and carry out a program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit food service programs for needy children in institutions providing child care. Any funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section shall remain available until expended.

"(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'institution' means any public or private nonprofit organization where children are not maintained in permanent residence including but not limited to day care centers, settlement houses, rec-

reation centers, family day care centers, Headstart centers, and institutions providing day care services for handicapped children. No such institution shall be eligible to participate in this program unless it has either local, State, or Federal licensing or approval as a child-care institution, or can satisfy the Secretary that it is in compliance with the applicable Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements of 1968: *Provided, however*, That lack of tax exempt status shall not prohibit eligibility for any institution under this section. The term 'State' means any of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Any institution shall receive the special food service program upon its request.

"(b) (1) APPORTIONMENT TO THE STATES.—For each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the Secretary shall make special food service payments no less frequently than on a monthly basis to each State educational agency in an amount no less than the sum of the product obtained by multiplying (a) the number of breakfasts served in special food service programs within that State by the national average payment rate for breakfasts under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 as amended, (b) the number of breakfasts served in special food service programs within that State to children from

families whose incomes meet the eligibility criteria for free school meals by the national average payment rate for free breakfasts under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 as amended, (c) the number of breakfasts served in special food service programs, within that State to children from families whose incomes meet the eligibility criteria for reduced price school meals by the national average payment rate for reduced price school breakfasts under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 as amended, (d) the number of lunches and suppers served in special food service programs within that State by the national average payment rate for lunches under section 4 of the National School Lunch Act, (e) the number of lunches and suppers served in special food service programs within that State to children from families whose incomes meet the eligibility criteria for free school meals by the national average payment rate for free school lunches under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act, (f) the number of lunches and suppers served in special food service programs in that State to children whose families meet the eligibility criteria for reduced price school meals by the national average payment factor for reduced price lunches under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act, (g) the number of snacks served in special food service programs in that State by 5 cents; (h) the number of snacks served in special food service programs in that State to children from

families whose incomes meet the eligibility criteria for free school meals by 20 cents, (i) the number of snacks served in special food service programs in that State to children from families whose incomes meet the eligibility criteria for reduced price school meals by 15 cents. The rates established pursuant to subsection (g), (h), and (i) shall be adjusted semiannually to the nearest one-fourth cent by the Secretary to reflect the changes in the series for food away from home of the Consumer Price Index published by the Department of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor: *Provided*, That the initial such adjustment shall be effective January 1, 1976, and shall reflect changes in the series food away from home during the period June through November 1975. Reimbursement for meals provided under this subsection or under subsection (2) of this section shall not be dependent upon collection of moneys from participating children.

"(2) For each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the Secretary shall make further special food service payments no less frequently than a monthly basis to each State educational agency in amounts equal to the sum of the product obtained by multiplying the number of breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and snacks served in special food service programs within that State by institutions that are determined to be especially needy by the difference between the cost of providing such meals (which

shall include the full cost of obtaining, handling, serving, and preparing food as well as supervisory and administrative costs and indirect expenses, but not including the cost of equipment provided for under section 18 of this Act) and the respective rates for such meals specified in subsection (1).

"(3) No later than the first day of each month, the Secretary shall forward to each State an advance payment for meals served in that month pursuant to subsections (1) and (2) of this section, which payment shall be no less than the total payment made to such State for meals served pursuant to subsections (1) and (2) of this section for the most recent month for which final reimbursement claims have been settled. The Secretary shall forward any remaining payment due pursuant to subsections (1) and (2) of this section no later than thirty days following receipt of valid claims: *Provided*, That any funds advanced to a State for which valid claims have not been established within ninety days shall be deducted from the next appropriate monthly advance payments, unless the claimant requests a hearing with the Secretary prior to the ninetieth day.

"(c) Meals served by institutions participating in the program under this section shall consist of a combination of foods and shall meet minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional

research. Such meals shall be served free to needy children. No physical segregation or other discrimination against any child shall be made because of his inability to pay, nor shall there be any overt identification of any such child by special tokens or tickets, announced or published lists of names or other means. No institution shall be prohibited from serving a breakfast, lunch, dinner, and snack to each eligible child each day.

"(d) Funds paid to any State under this section shall be disbursed by the State agency to institutions approved for participation of a nondiscriminatory basis to reimburse such institutions for all costs including labor and administrative expenses, of food service operations. All valid claims from such institutions shall be paid within thirty days.

"(e) Irrespective of the amount of funds appropriated under section 13 of this Act, foods available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) or purchased under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), or section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1446a–1), shall be donated by the Secretary of Agriculture to institutions participating in the special food service program in accordance with the needs as determined by authorities of these institutions for utilization in their feeding programs. The amount of such commodities donated to each State for each fiscal year shall be, at

a minimum, the amount obtained by multiplying the number of lunches served in participating institutions during that fiscal year by the rate for commodities and cash in lieu thereof established for that fiscal year in accordance with the provisions of section 6(e) of the National School Lunch Act.

"(f) If in any State the State educational agency is not permitted by law or is otherwise unable to disburse the funds paid to it under this section to any service institution in the State, the Secretary shall withhold all funds provided under this section and shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to service institutions to the State for the same purpose and subject to the same conditions as are required of a State educational agency disbursing funds made available under this section.

"(g) The value of assistance to children under this section shall not be considered to be income or resources for any purpose under any Federal or State laws, including laws relating to taxation and welfare and public assistance programs. Expenditures of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of food programs for children shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this section.

"(h) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to the Secretary for his administrative expenses under this section.

"(i) States, State educational agencies, and service institutions participating in programs under this section shall keep such accounts and records as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to determine whether there has been compliance with this section and the regulations hereunder. Such accounts and records shall at all times be available for inspection and audit by representatives of the Secretary and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of five years, as the Secretary determines is necessary.".

SEC. 14. The National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 17. As a national nutrition and health policy, it is the purpose and intent of the Congress that the special food service program and the summer food program be made available in all service institutions where it is needed to provide adequate nutrition for children in attendance. The Secretary is hereby directed, in cooperation with State educational and child-care agencies, to carry out a program of information to the schools in furtherance of this policy. Within ninety days after the enactment of this legislation, the Secretary shall report to the committees of jurisdiction in the Congress his plans and those of the cooperating State agencies to bring about the needed expansion in the special food service and summer food program.".

NONFOOD ASSISTANCE

SEC. 15. The National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 18. (1) Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the authorization contained in section 13 and section 16 of the Act, $5,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of providing, during each such fiscal year, nonfood assistance for the special food service program, and the summer food program, pursuant to the provisions of this Act. The Secretary shall apportion among the States during each fiscal year the aforesaid sum of $5,000,000: *Provided*, That such an apportionment shall be made according to the ratio among the States of the number of children below age 6 who are members of households which have an annual income not above the applicable family size income level set forth in the income poverty guideline prescribed by the Secretary under section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act.

"(2) If any State cannot utilize all of the funds apportioned to it under the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall make further apportionments to the remaining States. Payments to any State of funds apportioned under the provisions of this subsection for any fiscal year shall be made upon condition that at least one-fourth of the cost of equipment financed under this section shall be borne by

funds from sources within the State, except that such condition shall not apply with respect to funds used under this section to assist institutions determined by the State to be especially needy.

"(3) For purposes of this section, the term 'State' shall mean any of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(4) If in any State the State educational agency is not permitted by law or is otherwise unable to disburse the funds paid to it under this section to any service institution in the State, the Secretary shall withhold all funds apportioned under this section and shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to service institutions in the State for the same purpose and subject to the same conditions as are required of a State educational agency disbursing funds made available under this section.".

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 16. Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is revised to read as follows:

"(a) The Congress finds that substantial numbers of pregnant women, infants, and young children are at special risk in respect to their physical and mental health by reason of poor or inadequate nutrition and/or health care. There-

fore, it is the intent of this act to provide supplemental nutritious food as an adjunct to good health care during these critical times of growth and development in order to prevent the occurrence of these health problems.

"(b) For each fiscal year the Secretary shall make cash grants to the health department or comparable agency of each State, Indian tribe, band or group recognized by the Department of the Interior; or the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of providing funds to local health or welfare agencies or private nonprofit agencies of such State, Indian tribe, band, or group recognized by the Department of the Interior; or the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, serving local health or welfare needs to enable such agencies to carry out health and nutrition programs under which supplemental foods will be made available to all pregnant or lactating women and to infants determined by competent professionals to be nutritional risks because of inadequate nutrition and inadequate income, in order to improve their health status. Such program shall be carried out without regard to whether a food stamp program or supplemental food program or a direct food distribution program is in effect in such area.

"(c) In order to carry out the program provided for under subsection (b) of this section during each fiscal year,

the Secretary shall use $300,000,000 out of funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612(c)). In order to carry out such program during each fiscal year, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $300,000,000, but in the event that such sum has not been appropriated for such purpose by July 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall use $300,000,000, or, if any amount has been appropriated for such program, the difference, if any, between the amount directly appropriated for such purpose and $300,000,000, out of funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612(c)). Any funds expended from such section 32 to carry out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be reimbursed out of any supplemental appropriation hereafter enacted for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such subsection, and such reimbursements shall be deposited into the fund established pursuant to such section 32, to be available for the purpose.

"(d) Whenever any program is carried out by the Secretary under authority of this section through any State or local or nonprofit agency, he is authorized to pay administrative costs not to exceed 25 percentum of the projected program funds provided to each State under the authority of this section: *Provided*, That each health department or comparable agency of each State, Indian tribe, band, or group rec-

ognized by the Department of the Interior; or the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare receiving funds from the Secretary under this section shall, by January 1, each year, for approval by him as a prerequisite to receipt of funds under this section, submit a description of the manner in which administrative funds shall be spent, including, but not limited to, a description of the manner in which nutrition education and outreach services will be provided. Outreach funds shall be used to search out those most in need of the benefits of this program. The Secretary shall take affirmative action to insure that programs begin in areas most in need of special supplemental food: *Provided further*, That during the first three months of any program, or until the program reaches its projected caseload level, whichever comes first, the Secretary shall pay those administrative costs necessary to successfully commence the program.

"(e) The eligibility of persons to participate in the program provided for under subsection (a) of this section shall be determined by competent professional authority. Participants shall be residents or members of populations served by clinics or other health facilities determined to have significant numbers of infants and pregnant and lactating women at nutritional risk.

"(f) State or local agencies or groups carrying out any programs under this section shall maintain adequate medi-

cal records of the participants assisted to enable the Secretary to determine and evaluate the benefits of the nutritional assistance provided under this section. The Secretary shall convene an advisory committee made up of representatives from the Maternal and Child Health Division, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Center for Disease Control, the Association of State and Territorial Public Health Nutrition Directors, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Academy of Science—National Research Council, the American Dietetic Association, the American Public Health Association, the Public Health Service, and others as the Secretary deems appropriate. This committee shall study the methods available to successfully and economically evaluate in part or in total, the health benefits of the special supplemental food program. Their study shall consider the usefulness of the medical data collected and the methodology used by the Department of Agriculture and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to March 30, 1975. Their study shall also include the applicability to an evaluation of the special supplemental food program of Federal and State health, welfare, and nutrition assessment and surveillance projects currently being conducted. The purpose of this advisory committee shall be to determine and recommend in detail how, using accepted scientific methods, the health benefits of the special supple-

mental food program may best be evaluated and assessed. This advisory committee shall report to the Secretary no later than December 1, 1975. The Secretary shall submit to Congress his recommendations based on this study no later than March 1, 1976.

"(g) Definition of terms used in this section—

"(1) 'Pregnant and lactating women' when used in connection with the term 'at nutritional risk' includes mothers up to six months post partum from low-income populations who demonstrate one or more of the following characteristics: known inadequate nutritional patterns, unacceptably high incidence of anemia, high prematurity rates, or inadequate patterns of growth (underweight, obesity, or stunting). Such term (when used in connection with the term 'at nutritional risk') also includes low-income individuals who have a history of high-risk pregnancy as evidenced by abortion, premature birth, or severe anemia.

"(2) 'Infants' when used in connection with the term 'at nutritional risk' means children under five years of age who are in low-income populations which have shown a deficient pattern of growth, by minimally acceptable standards, as reflected by an excess number of children in the lower percentiles of height and weight. Such term, when used in connection with 'at nutritional risk', may also include children under five years of age who (A) are in the param-

eter of nutritional anemia, or (B) are from low-income populations where nutritional studies have shown inadequate infant diets. Any child participating in a nonresidential child care program shall not be excluded from participating in the WIC program.

"(3) 'Supplemental foods' shall mean those foods containing nutrients known to be lacking in the diets of populations at nutritional risks and, in particular, those foods and food products containing high-quality protein, iron, calcium, vitamin A, and vitamin C. Such term may also include (at the discretion of the Secretary) any commercially formulated preparation specifically designed for women or infants. The contents of the food package shall be made available in such a manner as to provide flexibility based on medical necessity or cultural eating patterns.

"(4) 'Competent professional authority' includes physicians, nutritionists, registered nurses, dietitians, or State or local medically trained health officials as being competent professionally to evaluate nutritional risk.

"(5) 'Administrative costs' incude costs for outreach, referral, operation, monitoring, nutrition education, general administration, startup, clinic, and administration of the State WIC office.

"(h) (1) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant,

and Fetal Nutrititon (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Council') which shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary. One member shall be a State director of the special supplemental food program, one member shall be a State fiscal director for the special supplemental food program (or the equivalent thereof), one member shall be a State health officer (or equivalent thereof), one member shall be a project director of a special supplemental food program in an urban area, one member shall be a project director of a special supplemental food program in a rural area, one member shall be a State public health nutrition director (or equivalent thereof), two members shall be parent recipients of the special supplemental food program, one member shall be a pediatrician, one member shall be an obstetrician, one member shall be a person involved at the retail sales level of food in the special supplemental food program, two members shall be officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, specially qualified to serve on the Council because of their education, training, experience, and knowledge in matters relating to maternal, infant, and fetal nutrition, and two members shall be officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture, specially qualified because of their education, training, experience, and knowledge in matters relating to maternal, infant, and fetal nutrition.

"(2) The eleven members of the Council appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture shall be appointed for terms of three years, except that the nine members first appointed to the Council shall be appointed as follows: Three members shall be appointed for terms of three years, three members shall be appointed for terms of two years, and three members shall be appointed for terms of one year. Thereafter all appointments shall be for a term of three years, except that a person appointed to fill an unexpired term shall serve only for the remainder of such term. Members appointed from the Department of Agriculture shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

"(3) The Secretary shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman of the Council.

"(4) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but shall meet at least once a year.

"(5) Eight members shall constitute a quorum and a vacancy on the Council shall not affect its powers.

"(6) It shall be the function of the Council to make a continuing study of the operation of the special supplemental food program and any related Act under which diet supplementation is provided to women, infants, and children, with a view to determining how such programs may be improved. The Council shall submit to the President and the

50-215 O - 75 -- 14

Congress annually a written report of the results of its study together with such recommendations for administrative and legislative changes as it deems appropriate.

"(7) The Secretary shall provide the Council with such technical and other assistance, including secretarial and clerical assistance, as may be required to carry out its functions under this Act.

"(8) Members of the Council shall serve without compensation but shall receive reimbursement for necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Council.

"(i) On September 1, 1975, the Secretary shall forward to each State an advance payment for the month of September pursuant to subsection (c) of this section which shall not be less than the total payment made to such State for the month of July 1975, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and the Secretary shall forward any remaining payment due pursuant to subsection (c) of this section for the month of September 1975 no later than thirty days following the receipt of valid claims. Thereafter, on the first day of each month the Secretary shall, in a similar manner, forward an advance monthly payment to each State pursuant to subsection (c) of this section which shall not be less than the total payment made to such State in the second preceding month pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and the

Secretary shall forward any remaining payment due pursuant to subsection (c) of this section for such month no later than thirty days following receipt of valid claims: *Provided*, That any funds advanced to a State for which valid claims have been established within ninety days shall be deducted from the next appropriate monthly advance payment, unless the claimant requests a hearing with the Secretary prior to the ninetieth day. On each July 1 and on each January 1 the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the amount of advance payments to be made to each State pursuant to this subsection for that month.".

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF S. 850

School Breakfast Program

(SECTION 2)

This section merely extends the School Breakfast Program for three more years.

(SECTION 3)

This section directs the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program of information to States in regard to the School Breakfast Program. National participation in this program is only 10% of the School Lunch Program. Some schools may be uninformed as to the availability or the benefits of this program, and this section is an attempt to reach them and bring them into participation.

Matching

(SECTION 4)

This section makes a technical change in the $3:1 State matching requirement under the National School Act. It is needed because the nature of the School Lunch Program is changing slightly with more free meals being served. The result is that States are unable to meet, in every instance, the matching requirements as much of this money has come from paying children. This change will not affect the amount of appropriated funds needed from the State or local level.

Income Guidelines for Reduced Price Lunches

(SECTION 5)

This section increases the eligibility for reduced price lunches to include more children from middle-income families. Last year this provision was also slightly expanded, and resulted in increased participation by tens of thousands of children daily. In many States, this helped keep total participation levels equal to the year before, as many other paying children dropped out of the program as food costs went up. This section is specifically intended to help those lower-middle income families who have felt the pinch of greatly increased food prices and have children in school. By expanding the eligibility for reduced price lunches, children from families whose incomes aren't so low as to qualify them for a free lunch but who come from working families with not a great deal of income, will be able to participate in the School Lunch Program, instead of dropping out. This section should help stem the flow of millions of paying children who have dropped out of the program in the last few years.

Non-Profit Private Schools

(SECTION 6)

This section makes a technical change, deleting some matching language that is no longer needed as a result of the newer performance funding requirements of the National School Lunch Act.

Miscellaneous Provisions and Definitions

(SECTION 7)

This section changes the definition of school to include licensed non-profit private residential institutions such as orphanages, homes for the mentally retarded, etc.

Currently only 9.3% of children in institutional care participate in the National School Lunch Program. The rest receive some federally donated commodities and some milk assistance. However, they receive nothing approaching the benefits of the School Lunch Program, in commodities or per meal reimbursements.

The vast majority (80%) of these children would be eligible for the School Lunch Program if they resided at home. The purpose of this section is to give them the same valuable nutritional support through the School Lunch Program as other children their age receive, who live at home and attend school. In their bloc grant proposal for all child nutrition programs, the administration provides in their budget for per meal reimbursements to institutionalized children. This section does the same.

Commodities

(SECTION 8)

This section extends per meal commodity donations for the School Lunch Program. These commodities provide the foundation for this important program, and help support our agricultural market. School lunch administrators and personnel are overwhelmingly in support of this extension. Without it, school meal costs would increase drastically, because many school districts cannot get commodities at the same price the Department of Agriculture can, nor could they inspect or grade the foods with the same efficiency. If schools lost the commodities and lunch prices went up, a large number of the 25 million children receiving meals each day would either pay higher prices than they are now paying, receive inferior meals, or drop out of the program.

In addition to maintaining commodity support for the School Lunch Program, this section restores to the School commodity program flour, oil and shortening. The Department of Agriculture has withheld these commodities this entire school year while increasing shipment of them overseas. As a result, they are unavailable to schoolchildren for the first time in many years. Their loss has hurt local school districts that had facilities and employees intact to prepare foods for them, and the children who had been receiving them for years. Their loss has also been a factor in the increased prices paid this year by participating children. This section merely restores those cereal, shortening, and oil products which had previously been available to the schools.

Commodities

(SECTION 9)

This section continues the current practice of providing the bulk of the commodity assistance to the School Lunch Program in the form of food, not cash to purchase food. USDA and Nutrition Committee studies show the purchasing power advantage held by USDA. If assistance under this section were given to schools in cash and not commodities, the local school districts would be presented with an added fiscal burden, as purchasing the same foods as USDA would cost them more, thus driving up the cost to children and driving some from the program. Authorization for this practice ends this year.

(SECTION 10)

This section makes a very minor addition to the National School Lunch Act, by excluding benefits of the school lunch program from computation of income under any Federal or State laws.

(SECTION 11)

This section makes Puerto Rico eligible for the Special Milk Program.

Summer Feeding

(SECTION 12)

The summer food program is extended for two years with minor changes. The section places a ceiling on reimbursement rates that may be paid for meals served in especially needy institutions participating in the program, with a provision that this ceiling be adjusted annually in accordance with changes in the food away from home series of the Consumer Price Index. (This is the same adjustment formula used in the school food programs.)

The ceiling for lunches served in needy institutions would be set at 80 cents, a level 9.5% above the 73 cent maximum set by USDA for last summer's program.

This section would also make the program available to short-term residential camps for low-income youngsters. When Rep. Charles Vanik (D.-Ohio) sponsored the legislation that created this program in 1968, he stated on the House floor that the intent of the legislation was to include such camps, but USDA has arbitrarily barred their participation by regulation.

Special Food Service Program

(SECTION 13)

This section of the bill would bring the Special Food Service Program for children (under which reimbursements are provided to non-residential child care institutions for meals served to attending children) into accordance with the same procedures and requirements that apply in the school lunch and breakfast programs. As in the school programs, participating institutions would be required to collect income statements from parents or guardians, and institutions

would then receive the same per meal reimbursements, and the same per meal amounts of commodities, as are provided the schools in the school food programs.

This should lead to more effective and efficient operation of the program. At present, States are hindered by an archaic apportionment formula under which some States never have enough money and other States return funds unspent each year. In addition, at present some poor children are barred from the program solely because their day-care center is not located in a hard-core poverty area, while non-poor children within a poverty area receive as much reimbursement per meal as poor children. The procedures of the school food programs, which have proven effective for providing reimbursement on behalf of each participating child in accordance with the income of the child's family, would resolve these inequities and greatly strengthen and regularize program operations.

Reimbursements would continue to be available for the serving of suppers and meal supplements in that small percentage of participating institutions which provide these meals.

This section also makes the special food service program available for the first time to licensed, non-profit family day care centers, which are currently excluded from the program solely on the basis of Agriculture Department regulations.

(SECTION 14)

This section acknowledges the intent of Congress to make available the Special Food Service Program and the Summer Feeding Program to all eligible children. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to devise a plan of information to the States, to educate them as to the availability of these programs.

Non-Food Assistance

(SECTION 15)

This section directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make available and apportion among the States $5,000,000 for equipment assistance to the Special Food Service Program and the Summer Food Program. Both of these programs, according to administrators who have testified before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and according to GAO, have suffered from lack of money for equipment. This section for the first time mandates a certain amount of equipment money for these two programs, and should assist them in providing clean and professional nutrition delivery programs.

Special Supplemental Food Program

(SECTION 16)

This section extends and expands the program known as WIC (Women, Infants, and Children).

This program provides high-protein diet supplementation to low income women, infants, and children found to be at nutritional risk.

The idea idea behind the original pilot legislation was to reach people during those critical periods when nutrition intervention would do the most good for them and therefore give the taxpayers the best return on their tax dollar.

This section makes WIC a permanent program. The response from the States warrants no less of a commitment.

This section attempts to correct many of the problems which have been discovered during this initial implementation period, and reflects extensive input from WIC administrators and participants which has been received by the staff of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

The medical evaluation component has been revised so that some of the problems of the early evaluation which have been discovered and discussed by the GAO can be corrected. The new evaluation component requires the Secretary to meet with a group of experts in the field of maternal, fetal, and infant nutrition. This group will have studied the original evaluation, taken a look at existing health and nutrition assessment methods, and developed a plan for implementing a specific evaluation geared to the WIC program, and/or a plan for using WIC data in other assessments, if either is feasible. This way, there is a potentiality for using the acceptable data gathered in the first evaluation and devising new methods. It is hoped a smaller in-depth study over a longer period of time will be possible to determine the impact of this diet supplementation.

This section also increases the percent of total funds available for administrative expenses and includes within that increased monies for nutrition education and outreach. The need for both an increase in administrative funds and provisions for nutrition education have been emphasized repeatedly by WIC administrators as necessary to make the program work effectively.

The components of administrative expenses are clearly spelled out; start-up costs are allowed in sufficient amounts to allow any program to get itself off the ground; women are allowed to continue to receive foods for six months after birth, as opposed to six weeks, in order to allow them a longer period to catch up from nutritional depletion resulting from childbirth; children are allowed to participate through five years of age; not four, in an attempt to expand slightly their nutritional coverage during the preschool years; the food package is made flexible enough to cover certain medical needs or cultural eating patterns; advance payments to the States are required; and, a National Advisory Council is established for maternal, fetal, and infant nutrition.

This Council will be composed of administrators, health professionals, nutritionists, State and local WIC directors, and WIC participants. They will meet with the Secretary of Agriculture on a regular basis as an advisory panel, and issue a report once a year. This report will include the results of their oversight, and recommendations for the improvement of maternal, fetal, and infant nutrition programs.

○